



Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10575

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT No

NGI No

Project Title

Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities

Countries

Global, Fiji, Indonesia, Madagascar, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Tanzania

Agency(ies)

WWF-US

Other Executing Partner(s)

University of Queensland

Executing Partner Type

Others

GEF Focal Area

International Waters

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Climate Change Adaptation, Climate Change, Small Island Developing States, Private sector, National Adaptation Plan, Community-based adaptation, Sea-level rise, Livelihoods, International Waters,

Marine Protected Area, SIDS : Small Island Dev States, Learning, Pollution, Large Marine Ecosystems, Coastal, Biomes, Coral Reefs, Influencing models, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Indigenous Peoples, Type of Engagement, Participation, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Consultation, Local Communities, Private Sector, Capital providers, SMEs, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Communications, Education, Behavior change, Awareness Raising, Public Campaigns, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity Development, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Beneficiaries, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Enabling Activities, Adaptive management, Knowledge Generation, Knowledge Exchange, Targeted Research

Sector

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 2

Submission Date

12/21/2021

Expected Implementation Start

7/31/2022

Expected Completion Date

7/31/2026

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

630,000.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
IW-1-1	Strengthening blue economy opportunities through sustainable healthy coastal and marine ecosystems.	GET	3,500,000.00	35,669,267.00
IW-1-3	Addressing pollution reduction in marine environments	GET	3,500,000.00	35,669,267.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			7,000,000.00	71,338,534.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

Project Objective: To build capacity and solutions that ensure the long-term survival of climate refuge coral reef ecosystems, thereby conserving their biodiversity and supporting the blue economies and communities dependent on them.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Global to local capacity strengthening for climate refuge coral reef monitoring and conservation	Technical Assistance	Outcome 1.1. Government and non-government practitioners, academia and local communities are connected into networks of knowledge and best practices to identify solutions for the conservation of climate refuge coral reefs and connected ecosystems.	Output 1.1.1 At least six learning events at regional / global level for at least 500 practitioners (e.g., staff, policy makers, scientists students, community members).	GET	1,073,855.00	10,943,892.00
			Output 1.1.2 Online learning tools such as massive, open, on-line learning (plus alternative offline options) developed and benefiting at least 2500 relevant stakeholders (including communities, universities, and schools) across diverse expertise levels and languages (where possible).			
		Outcome 1.2. Near-real-time monitoring data and information is obtained at global to national scales to inform action by the national and regional hubs.	Output 1.2.1 Global climate refuge coral reef monitoring system prototype and Climate Data Platform developed and implemented in the 6 countries for management response by the national and regional hubs.			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2: Planning for climate refuge coral reef rescue at the national level	Technical Assistance	Outcome 2.1. Increased coordination and collaboration amongst stakeholders across sectors for the inclusive conservation and management of climate refuge reefs over the long term.	<p>Output 2.1.1 Six National Climate Refuge Coral Reef Hubs (stakeholder coordination platforms) created, connected, and strengthened, including key sectors such as marine, planning, environment, health, to lead the planning process under 2.2.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2 Training and operational support for strengthening community representation in national hubs, to effectively participate in the planning process under outcome 2.2. and activities under Component 3</p> <p>Output 2.1.3 Consultative and collaborative process to integrate traditional knowledge and vision from local communities in national strategies for climate refuge reef conservation</p>	GET	2,977,814.00	30,347,557.00
		Outcome 2.2.				

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Financial solutions for climate refuge coral reef rescue	Technical Assistance	Outcome 3.1. Investment opportunities identified to promote increased sustainable financial flows to relevant seascapes and landscapes to reduce threats to climate refuge coral reefs.	<p>3.1.1 Technical assistance in countries to mobilize private and public investment opportunities for their national priorities identified under 2.2.4</p> <p>Output 3.1.2 Scoping of at least 100 existing and potential sustainable businesses including community based small and medium enterprises (in the 6 countries), including options for business expansion and start up</p> <p>Output 3.1.3 Technical assistance to national teams to prepare business filtering and support frameworks</p> <p>Output 3.1.4 Investments portfolio developed, including demonstrative sustainable livelihood projects in priority reefs in</p>	GET	1,643,689.00	16,751,192.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 4: Knowledge Management and Monitoring and Evaluation	Technical Assistance	Outcome 4.1. Increased awareness of governments, donors and climate refuge local communities, and knowledge (from local to global level) on the value of climate refuge coral reefs, their main threats, and good practices/actions for their conservation.	Output 4.1.1 Communication and awareness raising strategy (reaching the highest level of influence possible, including heads of state and ministers from the 6 countries, as well as local communities in the climate refuge reefs) designed and implemented at local and global level including firsthand narratives on how coral decline is affecting livelihoods.	GET	971,309.00	9,898,824.00
			Outcome 4.1.2 Knowledge management and communication products, such as firsthand narratives and lessons on community driven solutions for coral reef conservation.			
			Outcome 4.1.3 Participation in at least two IW: LEARN regional meetings, one GEF International Waters Conference, and other masterclasses and knowledge			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	6,666,667.00	67,941,465.00

Project Management Cost (PMC)

	GET		333,333.00		3,397,069.00	
Sub Total(\$)			333,333.00		3,397,069.00	
Total Project Cost(\$)			7,000,000.00		71,338,534.00	

Please provide justification

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Civil Society Organization	Arizona State University, The Alan Coral Atlas	Grant	Investment mobilized	20,500,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Rare	Grant	Investment mobilized	808,166.00
Civil Society Organization	Rare	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	193,612.00
Civil Society Organization	Blue Ventures Conservation	Grant	Investment mobilized	22,893,355.00
Civil Society Organization	WWF-Australia	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,198,251.00
Civil Society Organization	Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)	Grant	Investment mobilized	5,451,637.00
Civil Society Organization	CARE	Grant	Investment mobilized	951,554.00
GEF Agency	WWF-US	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	840,000.00
Civil Society Organization	University of Queensland	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,019,842.00
Civil Society Organization	University of Queensland International Development	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	682,117.00
Other	WWF-US: Margaret A Cargill Philanthropies	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	800,000.00
Donor Agency	WWF-US (GCF Funding to WWF-Fiji and WWF-Solomon Islands)	Grant	Investment mobilized	15,000,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				71,338,534.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The WWF-US office has identified 15 Million USD in co-financing through the GCF Coral Reef Rescue Initiative Projects in Solomon Islands and Fiji. Although the overall project budgets for Fiji and Solomon Islands are higher than the 15 million mentioned as co-financing, we can only account for project activities that will be implemented during the same time period as the WWF GEF CRR Project. Of the countries that the GCF Coral Reef Rescue Program plans to encompass, Fiji and Solomon Islands are the most developed projects thus far and will be the only projects to coincide with the WWF GEF CRR project timing with an approximate 3-year overlap. Co-financing commitments from the Coral Reef Rescue Initiative Partners; Rare, Blue Ventures, WCS, Care, Blue Ventures and the University of Queensland are stated in the co-financing commitment table C. Multiple discussions with partners led to an agreement on the overall objective of the project, aligning with the CRRI initiative. The CRRI Partners will be working in the 6 countries alongside the WWF GEF CRR Project throughout the period of project implementation. Investments the partners make in countries will be considered co-financing in support of the overall initiative objective. 20 Million USD of Investment mobilized Co-financing has been identified from Arizona State University, Allen Coral Atlas. The Allen Coral Atlas (ACA) combines cutting edge coral reef science and satellite imagery remote sensing with mapping and monitoring techniques to create monitoring products to aid science and conservation efforts. The ACA is provides an important baseline of the CRR project. It presents the first globally consistent geomorphic and benthic habitat mosaic maps for all shallow water tropical coral reefs, and will includes analytical and monitoring tools including for tracking a real time coral bleaching detection and coastal turbidity measurements. Given the expensive nature of satellite technologies, this is a valuable contribution. The Arizona State University is the institution that currently hosts and leads the ACA. The co-finance contributed by the Arizona State University to the project, refer to investments mobilized that will be used during the lifetime of the project, to continue developing and refining the ACA, adding additional indicators derived from satellite imagery and additional functionalities, to create a near ? real time monitoring product. That product will be the foundation for the global climate refuge coral reef monitoring system and the Coral Reefs & Climate Data Platform that the project will implement, to make the data and monitoring systems accessible to the 6 project countries, as described under Outcome 2.1.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
WWF-US	GET	Global	International Waters	International Waters	7,000,000	630,000	7,630,000.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)					7,000,000.00	630,000.00	7,630,000.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required **true**

PPG Amount (\$)

200,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

18,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
WWF-US	GET	Global	International Waters	International Waters	200,000	18,000	218,000.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					200,000.00	18,000.00	218,000.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	4000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	4,000.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Submitted

Indicator 7 Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Shared water Ecosystem		Global		
Count	0	1	0	0

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)
------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Indicator 7.2 Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional management institution(s) (RMI) to support its 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)
------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Indicator 7.3 Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees (IMC; scale 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)
------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Indicator 7.4 Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products(scale 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)
------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Global		4		
Select SWE				<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	5,000	4,925		
Male	5,000	4,925		
Total	10000	9850	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

The proposed project will generate global environmental benefits that will be measured through the following GEF Core Indicators, aligned with the GEF International Waters: [GEF Core Indicator 4.1] Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, non-certified) Through the National Action Plans for Climate Refugees, the project will support stakeholders across a diversity of sectors and levels to come together to identify, negotiate and commit to priority actions to improve land use practices in a manner that will significantly mitigate threats to climate refuge reefs for at least 4000ha across the 6 countries (**Note ? target may be revised following the threats analysis) [GEF Core Indicator 7.4] Level of engagement in IW: Learn through participation and delivery of key products By year 2, a project website will be established in line with IW:LEARN guidance and by year 4, project staff and country representatives will have actively participated at International Waters Conferences as well as provided spatial data and other data points via the Knowledge Hub and Climate Data Platforms (Component 1) ? Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (target, 9,850). Through the creation of global knowledge networks, the project will increase knowledge and technical capacities of government and non-governmental actors and stakeholders (including communities, private sector, and academia) on addressing critical threats to climate refuge reefs as well as the use of data to better engage in evidence informed planning and decision making. In addition, communities and other stakeholders will be involved in training to strengthen capacities for the meaningful and inclusive engagement of local communities as well as strengthen skills and knowledge through engagement in Hub activities such as analysis and planning. Under Component 4, individuals with small and medium enterprises as well as larger businesses will be supported to strengthen their business plans and operations and better attract and engage with investors.

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

a. The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed;

There are no major changes in the project description from the original PIF. The full project document provides additional detail on the specific context of each country, informed by the stakeholder consultations. A summary of the project description provided in the full project document is provided below.

Environmental problems, threats and root causes

Coral reef systems across the world's oceans are currently experiencing major losses, including the Great Barrier Reef, the Indo-Pacific region, the Caribbean, and the Indian Ocean. Most of these reef systems have seen losses of 50 to 80 % of their coral cover in the last 50 years. Until a few decades ago, most of the threats on corals were driven by local stresses, often by the same human populations that benefited from coral reefs. Decline in coral abundance was largely driven by local stresses such as pollution, overharvesting and destructive extraction of fish, corals and other organisms, and unsustainable coastal development.

More recently, however, the principal drivers of global reef decline have been the warming and acidification of the world's oceans, with the impact of these changes on organisms and ecosystems growing rapidly. These global climatic drivers (e.g., warming and acidification of oceans, and intensifying storms) have combined with local threats to drive some of the most rapid decreases in coral cover ever recorded (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2019). Local anthropogenic threats identified across the six countries by stakeholder during the PPG included the following:

- ? Overfishing and destructive fishing practices
- ? Mining
- ? Land-based pollution
- ? Marine-based pollution

Stakeholders consulted during project design identified five types of barriers that they felt were critical for this GEF CRR project to focus on: i) Knowledge management; ii) Cross sectoral and stakeholder coordination; iii) Investments in coral reef conservation and management; iv) Awareness and

appreciation of coral reefs; and iv) Engagement local communities. The table below provides an overview of these barriers and the underlying drivers identified by stakeholders.

Barriers	Drivers identified
<p>Insufficient knowledge sharing, coordination and use of knowledge to inform policy and practice</p>	<p>? Insufficient and inadequate research (as a result of limited capacities, insufficient coordination between researchers and policy makers, lack of standards, rules and regulations on conducting research, lack of standardized research methods, limited consideration of indigenous and traditional knowledge, low levels of appreciation for the value and importance of scientific research)</p> <p>? Research carried out not accessed and used by policy and other decision makers, practitioners and primary stakeholders</p>
<p>Lack of coordinated strategies to address the greatest threats to resilient coral reef conservation at national levels</p>	<p>? Inadequacies in abilities to take a systemic view and approach to the conservation of coral reefs, taking into account ridge to reef linkages and relationships with a tendency to focus on protected areas</p> <p>? Platforms established to enable multistakeholder collaboration do not adequately address policy barriers and are often established by projects with a short term perspective</p> <p>? Sharing of information does not adequately extend to local communities and local governments</p> <p>? ?Silo? culture that limits coordination between stakeholders and sectors (lack of a shared vision and strategy)</p>
<p>Insufficient and inadequate investments for climate refuge coral reef conservation and sustainable livelihoods of associated communities</p>	<p>? Inadequate participation of private sector and investors in conservation as users and stakeholders of marine resources</p> <p>? Lack of a clear regulatory framework with incentives for investment (partnership frameworks, tax regimes etc.) aligned with private sector interests (<i>*note - this driver goes beyond the scope of the GEF CRR project</i>).</p> <p>? Investments in conservation and management are often channeled through short term projects which are insufficient as they do not enable effective engagement with the systemic drivers underpinning threats to coral reefs.</p> <p>? National strategic and economic models which drive investments in a country rarely recognize and account for the importance of ecosystems</p>

<p>Lack of awareness at global, national and local levels on the significance of resilient coral reef ecosystems</p>	<p>? Limited efforts and investments in developing community-friendly technical information that can be easily accessed and used by local communities</p> <p>? Gaps in awareness and understanding of governments of the importance of conserving and protecting marine and coastal ecosystems, including coral reefs for the blue economy</p> <p>? Limited understanding of the relationship between coral reefs and challenges faced by countries and communities, including the impacts of climate change</p> <p>? Lack of evidence to influence stakeholder to better support conservation action. For example, there are insufficient detailed studies to demonstrate the economic values of coral reefs and to understand the ecological impacts of climate change.</p>
<p>Poor local level natural resource governance and engagement of the men, women and youth directly dependent on coral reefs</p>	<p>? Inadequate regulatory mechanisms to officially allow for the participation of local communities in identifying and prioritising solutions</p> <p>? Limited access to reliable and updated information by local communities</p> <p>? Inadequate capacities of local communities to use information in prioritizing threats and identifying solutions of relevance to local challenges as well as for natural resource governance more broadly (understanding of legislation, organisational capacities etc)</p>

b. The baseline scenario and any associated baseline Programs;

The GEF CRR project sets out to consolidate the gains made through previous investments and to leverage a set of existing and planned initiatives at global, regional, and national levels, that aim at preserving coral reef ecosystems in the prioritized geographies, in each of the CRR countries. A summary of the initiatives identified is as follows (with the full list of baseline initiatives included in Appendix 2 of the full project document) :

Baseline initiatives of relevance to Component 1

Component 1 will intentionally build on existing networks, data sharing, and knowledge management platforms related to marine and coral reef conservation.

The baseline initiatives identified during the PPG will inform the stakeholder and needs analysis (Component 1.1.1) carried out at the onset of implementation.

Baseline initiatives relevant to the learning initiatives under Component 1.1. at the national level include capacity building centers such as the Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development (PaC-SD) in the Solomon Islands and the CTC training center for marine conservation in Indonesia. The GEF CRR project will build on the programs and networks established by these centers, drawing on their experiences and knowledge to ensure that the knowledge proposal developed responds to the needs and realities of the specific context.

With regards to the coral reef monitoring work under Outcome 1.2, at the global level, the project will leverage a set of existing platforms and systems to increase data availability and accessibility in the 6 countries. Baseline initiatives under this outcome include the Allen Coral Atlas (ACA) established by Vulcan and currently managed by Arizona State University, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Coral Reef Watch (CRW), as well as Data MERMAID Initiatives (WCS). The project will build also on the platforms, tools, and experience on massive open online training courses (MOOCs) established by UQ as well as the tools developed by the GEF project 'Capturing Coral Reef & Related Ecosystem Services (CCRES)', upscaling their utility, uptake and use across the six countries for climate refuge reef conservation and management. The project will increase the awareness and accessibility of the existing data products and platforms and use of these platforms by actors and organizations for evidence informed conservation and management of climate refuge reefs. It will also expand the existing use of global satellite products to produce additional tools and dashboards focused on the BCU areas. The project will establish linkages between global, regional and national data platforms, portals and monitoring networks such as the Pacific Environmental Portal established by the Secretariat of the South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP) and the Partnership in Environmental Management (PEMSEA) in East Asia; coastal hazard and climate early warning systems such as the Project C-Rise in South Africa, Mozambique and Madagascar; coral reef monitoring systems established at national level, such as the Coral Reef Mapping established by LAPAN in Indonesia and the database on coral reefs established for the National Action Plan for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (PANGIZC) in Madagascar.

Baseline initiatives of relevance to Component 2

Component two builds on existing stakeholder engagement platforms and networks as well as the outputs and outcomes of projects focusing on strengthening community engagement in conservation and management of coastal and marine resources in the 6 countries. In each of the countries, the project has identified existing platforms and committees to utilize for the National Hubs. These are:

- ? Fiji: Marine Working Group. (MWG)
- ? Solomon Islands: National Coordinating Committee on Coral Reefs, Fisheries & Food Security
- ? Indonesia: Indonesia Coral Reef Network (affiliated with CTI-CFF TWG-Seascape, TWG-MPA (under development)
- ? Philippines: MPA Support Network (MSN)

? Madagascar: The Madagascar Reefs Network (R?seau R?cif)

? Tanzania: The Tanzania Coral Reef Task Force (TzCRTF)

At national level, there are also several initiatives that have successfully developed tools and approaches for ensuring community voice and effective community participation in governance and management that constitute an important baseline for the project. These include initiatives carried out by the CRRI global partners such as the Fish Forever programs implemented by RARE in the Philippines and Indonesia; the Improvement of Biodiversity Monitoring in the Barren Islands (western coast) by Blue Ventures in Madagascar; and the Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE UP) programme that CARE is implementing in the Philippines. Other baseline initiatives focusing on community governance of natural resources at the national level include the Arnavons Marine Conservation Area (AMCA) by TNC in the Solomon Islands. The project will also draw on existing national data sets that provide social and gender related information from coral-reef dependent communities to inform the national action planning processes.

At the regional and global levels, the GEF CRR project will build on initiatives led by the CRRI global partners. This includes:

? The Blue Action Fund ? Current projects implemented by WWF and WCS are aimed at developing an expanded network of climate resilient, sustainable, and effectively managed Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) across the West Indian Ocean region and Melanesia. This includes areas in Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar, Fiji, and Solomon Islands. The initiative aims to achieve ambitious goals, including the creation and improved management of MPAs, the promotion of sustainable livelihoods in relation to fisheries management, and strengthened local community involvement in the stewardship of marine natural resources. The GEF CRR project will draw on the network established by the initiative for the establishment of the National Hubs in Madagascar, Fiji, and Solomon Islands. It will further seek to utilize the opportunity provided by this network of MPAs for the campaign and awareness raising projects to ensure a wider reach and to increase the appreciation of climate refuge reefs amongst the MPA community

? The WWF Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies (MACP), Phase 2, implemented in Indonesia, Madagascar, and Tanzania. This project is aimed at supporting learning and action for community-based conservation in coastal communities. Underlying project implementation is a strong learning agenda bringing together advances in science and holistic M&E to continue to improve coral reef conservation. Work in Indonesia has supported coastal marine management - integrating fisheries, marine protected areas, and community-based conservation. In Madagascar, the project is aimed at strengthening community resilience in the Northern Mozambique Channel, through adaptive marine resource management, including coral reef protection. In Tanzania this project will work to support learning and action for community-based livelihood and conservation initiatives for coastal communities in the targeted sites, addressing Poverty-Environment-Gender Nexus. The GEF CRR project will build on the outcomes and experiences of this initiative in the National Hubs.

? 50 Reefs conservation, WCS in partnership with Bloomberg Philanthropies? [Vibrant Oceans Initiative](#) (VOI). Climate change, overfishing, pollution, and unsustainable development threaten the survival of coral reefs. As part of the Vibrant Oceans Initiative, WCS works closely with government and local partners advocating for policies that strengthen the role of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in fisheries management and catalyzing political support for new marine protected areas. Internationally, our coral reef and policy experts are working to ensure actionable and science-based policies for coral reefs are prioritized in the post-2020 [Convention on Biological Diversity](#), to help safeguard our ocean's biodiversity centers and the food security and livelihoods of millions. WCS works to protect climate-resilient reefs in four countries (Fiji, Indonesia, Tanzania, and Kenya), centering community-led conservation efforts. The initiative is focused on the following: strategic partnerships, national policy reform, local conservation and fisheries management, and data-driven strategy and global transparency using the MERMAID monitoring platform (datamermaid.org).

Baseline initiatives of relevance to Component 3

Baseline initiatives focused on increasing financial resources available to coral reef conservation are somewhat limited as compared to those relevant to the other components. At the global level, the project will build on the experiences and Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) led by UNDP and explore the Global Fund for Coral Reefs for blended finance investment. Furthermore, the project will build on the outcomes of GCF projects currently under development in Fiji and the Solomon Islands, which include the establishment of a ?Community Facility? for community-level businesses and projects and a ?Development Facility? to provide further support and access to loan finance for larger more established businesses, potentially in partnership with local development banks.

At the national level, baseline initiatives were identified in Fiji, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Madagascar. Examples include the Environment and Climate Adaptation Levy (ECAL) in Fiji led by the Government, the Fish Forever program, as well as innovative finance strategies being led by RARE in Indonesia and the Philippines and by BIOFIN in Madagascar and the Philippines. The South West Indian Ocean ? NORAD Project (SWIO-NORAD) , a regional initiative encompassing Tanzania is focused on unlocking a sustainable blue economy; The project will also build on the experiences of the CARE country offices as well as WWF in microfinance such as the village savings and loan associations established by CARE country offices.

Baseline initiatives of relevance to Component 4

At the global level, the project will work closely with RARE's Coastal 500 initiative in the design and roll out of the global campaigns and awareness raising activities. The project will also build on the experiences and approaches used by Rare's Fish Forever Program behavior adoption campaigns that

aim to encourage positive behaviors from relevant stakeholders in support of sustainable coastal resource and fisheries management.

At the national level, the project will build on the Ocean Planning Team/PEUMP's social media campaign that promotes the significance of the ocean as a vital ecosystem such as the coral reefs that are unique in local cultures, sustain life and has potential climate adaptation measure. In Indonesia, the project will benefit from a number of different awareness campaigns that are underway with the leadership of the Government and well as WWF Indonesia. These include the Coral Stock Center, Threatened Species Awareness Program, Marine and Fishery Campaign as well as the awareness program being led by Blue Ventures to build awareness of government in six provinces to officially recognize LMMAs.

c. The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project;

The scale and complexity of the challenge is daunting and requires highly strategic investments that will catalyze transformational change at a scale and depth necessary to both save coral reefs as well as change the conditions that are driving the situation today.

This involves: -

- Focusing efforts on reefs within partner countries that are least exposed to climate change (i.e., climate refuge reefs) and are well positioned to also regenerate reefs as climate stressors stabilize; and which are critically important to the lives and livelihoods of the communities and economies that are dependent on them (also described in Section 1); and
- Ensuring that the necessary capabilities, opportunities, and motivation^[1] are in place at both the individual and institutional levels to create the conditions for long-term behavioral^[2] and institutional change.

This will be realized through directing energies and investments to areas within the climate refuge reefs prioritized by national and local stakeholders for action in the 6 countries. Within each country and at the global level, this project will consolidate and build on previous efforts (often carried out in a disjointed manner by different institutions) through the establishment of the following:

- ? **A global network of knowledge and best practice plus the planning and expansion of a monitoring platform**, ensuring accessibility of the best tools and science available as well as the skills and knowledge for communities, decision makers and practitioners to utilize the tools and science to inform and improve policy and practice at multiple levels.

? A **national multisectoral and stakeholder hub** in each of the 6 countries to enable the collaborative design and implementation of national and subnational action plans for the conservation of refuge reefs in their countries, informed by an analysis of threats, costs and benefits of conservation action vis a vis business as usual and the traditional knowledge and vision of local communities.

? An investment portfolio with demonstrative sustainable livelihood projects and potential investors identified for the priority areas; and

? A widespread awareness and communications strategy targeting **influential individuals and institutions** as well as the wider public on the value and importance of climate refuge reefs to local communities using their own voices as well on as the value and importance to economies and biodiversity nationally and globally.

In doing so, the project will ensure that there is a strong enabling environment in each of the countries to mobilize new investments and capabilities to support the action necessary for transformational change. This enabling environment includes:

- Collaboration and coordination across the diversity of sectors and stakeholders that have an influence or impact on the conservation and management of climate refuge reefs. This, in turn, will lead to negotiated synergistic solutions and reduce risks to future investments in climate refuge reefs. For example, a solution jointly designed between local communities and the environmental, mining and the agricultural sectors is more likely to be successful than a solution driven by only one or two of these stakeholders[3];
- Positioning and voice of women and men from local communities that depend and/or have an impact on climate refuge coral reefs in the decision making, planning and delivery of investment.
- Access and capabilities to use data, tools and resources in evidence informed planning and practice ? ensuring that the identification of priorities is informed by science as well as traditional and Indigenous knowledge.
- Readiness for investments, identifying reef-friendly businesses and investment opportunities and working closely with those with highest potential to be investor ready; and
- Awareness and support for climate refuge reefs amongst the wider public and particularly of influential individuals and institutions.

In realizing these outcomes, the project will not only maximize potential for mobilization of new investments but also reduce short- and long-term investment risk.

A description of the project components and outcomes is provided below:

[1] Informed by the COM-B model which demonstrates that behavior occurs because of interaction between three necessary conditions: Capability ? the psychological and physical capacity to engage; Motivation ? processes that energize and direct behavior, including analytical and informed decision making; and Opportunity ? the wider contextual factors that catalyze and enable changes in behavior

[2] The project will also draw on Rare?s Levers of Behavior Change Framework that identifies critical levers to shift behaviors (described in: https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/STAP%20Chair%27s%20Report%20to%20the%20GEF%20Council_December%202020.pdf?null=)

[3] During stakeholder consultations to develop the CRRRI global strategy, examples were shared across many countries of sectors such as mining undermining the efforts of environment and conservation and stakeholders emphasised the necessity and urgency of establishing integrated and holistic approaches to conservation and management of climate refuge reefs.

Component 1: Global to local capacity strengthening for climate refuge coral reefs monitoring and conservation. (GEF budget USD\$1,008,572)

Through activities that promote sharing, accessing, and using knowledge to inform action, Component 1 will promote global to local capacity strengthening for the monitoring and conservation of climate refuge coral reefs. Outputs include the connection of stakeholders to a global knowledge network and best practices, as well as integration of near-real time monitoring of key climate variables (see NOAA?s Coral Reef Watch program) into management strategies. The learning events will be designed to create space and opportunity for exchanging information, experiences and strategies as well as providing access to practical resources, tools, and training. They will be essential for assisting coastal communities in understanding the impacts of global change on critical resources and the changes to follow. This will involve encouraging and supporting individuals participating in the learning events to continue to interact with one another around shared interests and concerns through communities of practice using online platforms. The project will also train and strengthen capacities within project countries on how to use, interpret and adapt near-real time monitoring data for early warning systems and decision-making frameworks.

The outcomes in this Component will be realized through a collaborative effort led by the lead executing agency at the global level who will work with local stakeholders to bring together representatives of Technical Working Groups (TWGs) established under National Hubs (refer to Component 2) across the six countries. This group will work together as a ?Knowledge Unit? - a peer reference group, providing strategic guidance to ensure that the overall vision, approach, activities, and outputs are responsive and relevant to the needs and realities within each country. The TWG will comprise experts and knowledge holders in a range of areas (including technical, pedagogical, Indigenous etc.). This mechanism of participatory collaboration will also allow for consistency of strategies, relevance of produced content (including curriculum development and delivery methods), as well as overall alignment with the goals of the GEF CRR project and its stakeholders.

Outcomes under Component One are:

Outcome 1.1: Government and non-government practitioners, academia and communities are connected into networks of knowledge and best practices to identify solutions for the conservation of climate refuge coral reefs and connected ecosystems.

Under Outcome 1.1, the project will take advantage of the opportunities presented by the recent rapid evolution of online learning and training for increased knowledge and capacity strengthening in the six countries. Using these online learning events (including webinars, workshops, and customized discussion forums), the aim is to connect stakeholders to networks of knowledge and ensure that the six countries can engage in active and deep dialogue as they individually and collectively work to address the challenges and search for solutions for conserving priority coral reefs that are less exposed to climate change.

Outcome 1.2 Near-real-time monitoring data and information is obtained at global to national scales to inform action by national and regional hubs

Under this outcome, the project will work, in collaboration with partners such as the Allen Coral Atlas and NOAA (Coral Reef Watch, Washington DC), to prototype a global climate refuge coral reef monitoring system. The prototype monitoring system will include the identification of key climate, ecological and socio-economic indicators and identification of data sources and protocols. Focusing on the climate data sets, the project will establish a Climate Data Platform which will be hosted on the CRRRI Knowledge Hub. The Climate Data Platform will utilize and build on data sets that are currently available (based, in the first instance, on satellite imagery that is automatically refreshed on a regular basis for most of the data sets). The aim is to gradually expand the system to include biological, sociological, and economic data platforms as new resources are mobilized (outside of the scope of this project). The project will also strengthen capacities in the six countries for practitioners to utilize this system, allowing them to identify early detection of potential changes (or risk of change) in the condition of the least climate exposed coral reefs in each of the six countries. This will facilitate better planning, targeted monitoring, and climate refuge reef conservation and restoration efforts. At a higher level, this work will drive near-real time monitoring to be more inclusive, consistent, driven by user needs, scalable, and help to close the gap in using near-real time data to inform actions.

Component 2: Planning for climate refuge coral reef rescue at the national level (GEF budget

USD\$2,870,533)

Inclusive good governance of climate refuge coral reefs is central in their management and conservation. This includes cohesive and sustainable structures and processes for collaborative diagnosis of threats and root causes, measured prioritization of solutions informed by critical and negotiated analysis of costs and benefits, joint policy and decision making as well as the mobilization of the support and resources necessary to translate decisions into action (Morrison et al., 2020).

This component builds on multisectoral stakeholder platforms and processes that currently exist within the six countries to establish integrated approaches specifically aimed at ensuring inclusive management and conservation of climate refuge coral reefs. In establishing the platforms and processes, specific actions will be taken to ensure that processes are inclusive and fair, allowing for equal voice and opportunity to all stakeholders ? particularly the women, men, and youth dependent on climate refuge reefs. Efforts will be made to ensure formal recognition and integration within existing government structures and processes at both local and national levels to allow for ownership and longer-term sustainability. This will include integration of the shared vision for climate refuge reefs and synergistic solutions identified for their conservation and management within policies, strategies and plans of relevant economic growth, development, and conservation sectors.

The outcomes under this component will be achieved through building on existing capacities, structures, and processes within each country, including embedding the National Hubs within existing coordination platforms established for marine protected and conserved areas and integrated coastal zone management. The National Hub and the multistakeholder and sectoral processes that take place within the Hub are closely linked to the other three Components of this project. The knowledge and data made accessible under Component 1 as well as the capacities to utilize this knowledge will be instrumental in ensuring that planning processes are evidence informed. The priorities identified through the planning processes in Component 2 will guide the identification and prioritization of investment opportunities in Component 3. Component 4 will seek to build awareness and support for the National Hub and the Vision and Action Plan for Climate Refuge Reefs through the communication and awareness campaigns, as well as the firsthand narratives by communities on the significance of climate refuge reefs to their livelihoods and cultures.

There are two outcomes under this component:

Outcome 2.1. Increased coordination and collaboration amongst stakeholders across sectors for the inclusive conservation and management of climate refuge reefs over the long term

Outcome 2.1 will establish and strengthen the structures and capacities necessary to ensure that planning processes are inclusive and informed. Core structures will include a National Hub consisting of a diversity of actors and organizations working together through technical working groups with the strategic and political guidance of a high-level Steering Committee. Members of the National Hub will work together to define and establish their operating modalities (such as membership, representation and partnership engagement, communication, and outreach) in adherence to good practices and principles of inclusion, equity, transparency, and accountability.

Stakeholders will be supported to define a shared vision for the National Hubs, one that is informed by the vision and voice of the women, men and youth that are directly dependent on climate refuge reefs. To enable this, the project will support local communities to articulate their vision for multi stakeholder governance processes as well as build the capacities of government, non-governmental and private sector agencies participating in the Hub to ensure equal voice and influence of local communities participating in the Hub.

Outcome 2.2 A shared vision and agenda for climate refuge reefs developed through an evidence informed and inclusive planning processes

Outcome 2.2. is focused on the development of integrated national/sub-national action plans developed through inclusive planning processes informed by a sound analysis of threats, opportunities, costs and benefits of conservation and management of climate refuge reefs. The outcomes of the analysis processes will inform the development of a national level action plan for climate refuge reef conservation. Informed by the Community Vision (developed under 2.1.3), the planning process will involve facilitating stakeholders to deliberate and negotiate outcomes that combine multiscale and synergistic economic, social, and ecological interventions. Structures, processes, and resources necessary to operationalize the plan will be identified and a sustainability strategy for the National Hub and for the delivery of the Action Plan will be developed. The investment opportunities identified under Component 3 will contribute to the delivery of the action plan and sustainability strategy. In addition, efforts will be made to ensure the priorities identified are integrated and mainstreamed across the strategies, plans and budgets of the different sectors and stakeholders involved. These will be supported by high level and widespread public support mobilized through the communication strategy carried out under Component 4.1.1.

Component 3: Financial solutions for climate refuge coral reef rescue (GEF budget USD\$1,625,033).

Component 3 positions CRRI to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the growing interest in sustainable blue economy business models around the world, while influencing the way in which these economies develop to ensure that they reduce and avoid harm to climate refuge coral reefs. A sustainable blue economy will provide social and economic benefits for reef-dependent communities, protect, and restore the core functions of marine ecosystems, and secure economic stability over time with new economic sectors developed.

Currently, credible investment opportunities in the sustainable blue economy space are limited. Small scale businesses struggle to access capital for growth and larger enterprises are not able to adapt their business models without external support. There is a need to strengthen efforts to identify these opportunities and provide technical assistance to develop a portfolio of 'investor ready' opportunities in the blue economy in each of the CRRI countries. This will be realized through the following outcome:

Outcome 3.1 Investment opportunities identified to promote increased sustainable financial flows to relevant seascapes and landscape to reduce threats to climate refuge coral reefs

This outcome will be achieved by identifying the key economic sectors causing the degradation of coral reefs and supporting the development of new business models in these sectors, along with the adaptation of existing business models towards the sustainable blue economy. It will place particular emphasis on business models that create sustainable livelihood opportunities and community-centered enterprises. The Project will actively collaborate with and build upon the achievements of existing

initiatives, coordinating and supplementing activities to identify investment options to scale up financing for reef-friendly businesses in the target countries.

Component 4: Knowledge Management and Monitoring and Evaluation (GEF budget USD\$904,097).

This component focuses on strengthening support for climate refuge reefs and reaches out to raise awareness to actors and institutions that have the most influence and impact on climate refuge reefs and efforts to ensure their survival. It will create spaces for communities to share their own realities, their reliance on cultural and traditional ties to climate refuge reefs, using their own voices..

Component 4 will also ensure that the project uses monitoring of project progress, experiences, and lessons for adaptive management as well as sharing and communicating more widely at the regional and global level.

The project will actively participate in and contribute to IW: LEARN, including PMU attendance at regional meetings, the GEF IW Conference, and twinning exchanges. A website will be developed that is linked and searchable through IW: LEARN's International Waters Information Management System. This will be used to disseminate project results internationally and to relevant practitioners.

There are two outcomes under Component 4:

Outcome 4.1. Increased awareness of governments, donors and climate refuge local communities, and knowledge (from local to global level) on the value of climate refuge coral reefs, their main threats, and good practices/actions for their conservation.

High level and widespread support for climate refuge reefs will be important for the success of this project and similar interventions in the future. The project will build on the opportunities created by the increasing levels of awareness and engagement by the wider public across the world on the loss of nature and climate change through social media and other platforms. The project will harness the opportunities provided by this growing support for the environment and biodiversity to build awareness and support for climate refuge reefs and their importance for the survival of coral reefs, livelihoods, and economies. It will develop and roll out communication campaigns targeting those with the most influence and impact on climate refuge reefs to the extent that is realistic, including heads of state, ministers, local communities, investors and other influential actors and groups. Communication campaigns will use the knowledge generated under Component 1 and informed by the analysis and priorities identified under Component 2.

This component also seeks to provide local communities the opportunity to share their wealth of traditional and indigenous knowledge within their countries and beyond. Focusing on the climate refuge reefs in priority areas, the project will support local communities to share their histories, customs and cultures through their own voices, ways of knowing and valuing. Narratives, lessons and experiences generated will be shared through the knowledge platform and capacity strengthening

activities under Component 1, through meetings of the National Hub (Component 2), with investors and government officials in the awareness raising activities under Component 3 as well as regionally and globally through the IW:LEARN meetings, GEF International Waters Conference and other relevant events and platforms.

Outcome 4.2 Informed and adaptive project management

In line with the global initiative, CRRI, this project utilizes and adaptive management approach, supported by monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation tools and processes will be developed at the global level to ensure consistency in data gathering and analysis. Sense making and use of the outcomes of monitoring and evaluation for learning, communication, accountability, and adaptive management will take place at the national level through the National Hubs to ensure that all key stakeholders are involved. The projects monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes will support learning, communication, accountability, and adaptive management with the members of the National Hubs actively involved in contributing to and using the outcomes of M&E for learning and planning purposes.

Ultimate responsibility for M&E resides with the PMU and M&E Specialist, who will coordinate with the Technical Advisory Facility in each country. The Technical Advisory Facilities will be responsible for ensuring that data is collected in a timely manner, recording achievements against targets in the Results Framework and preparing the six monthly and annual progress reports and annual workplans. These will be consolidated by the M&E Specialist for onward submission to the Global Steering Committee.

d. Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies;

The proposed project aligns with the GEF's International Waters Focal Area Objective 1.1. Strengthening blue economy opportunities through sustainable healthy coastal and marine ecosystems. Recognizing that healthy coral reefs (and associated ecosystems, mangroves, and seagrass) are essential to economic development in the context of blue economy opportunities, the Coral Reef Initiative aligns to this IW Objective by fostering collaboration amongst the 6 countries (plus Cuba through co-financing) for improving their capacity to monitor and protect the most climate refuge coral reefs, that can secure the regeneration of coral reef globally. This will be done through a global network of knowledge and good practices. At the national level, the project will engage and create capacities of key stakeholders (governments, non-governmental organizations, private sector, and local communities), creating national Coral Reef Hubs, to increase collaboration and cross support for developing national plans for coral reef conservation. Those plans will directly support Blue Economy strategies in each country. Through the global networks and the national Hubs, the project will engage with national, regional, and global stakeholders to increase collaboration and cross support to investments and processes, including through IW-LEARN.

The project also indirectly aligns with IW's Objective 1.3. Addressing pollution reduction in marine environments. The Coral Reef Hubs in the 6 countries will facilitate, amongst others, the analysis of the main threats affecting climate refuge reefs in each country. Those analyses will inform the design of the National Action Plans. The project will provide support for the countries to secure funding from

private and public donors to implement the national action plans, helping countries reduce environmental threats to priority climate refuge coral reefs.

To complement existing GEF interventions within the International Waters Focal Area Strategy, the Coral Reef Rescue Project will give special consideration to multi-country Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), as well as opportunities in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (Solomon Islands is part of this project). The project will incorporate any relevant TDAs/SAPs guidance into the national action plans (Outcome 2.1). Whenever feasible, the project will identify opportunities to align and support integration of climate refuge coral reef protection considerations into regional cooperation and transboundary governance frameworks. Aligned to SAPs strategic actions, the project will give special consideration to creating capacities, knowledge management platforms, coral reef monitoring tools, awareness/education, national action plans and investment portfolios, therefore supporting the referred SAPs objectives, and facilitating on the ground implementation. The project will strengthen capacities of LME managers and practitioners, supporting and participating in existing learning communities, such as IW:LEARN, LME:LEARN, including the dissemination of best practices and lessons learned generated from the project.

e. Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the

GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing;

A global analysis by University of Queensland and partners showed that some reefs have a substantially lower exposure to climate change stress due to local oceanographic conditions such as currents and upwelling. The work of UQ and partners has identified these climate refuge reef areas. These climate refuge and connected reefs embody the regeneration potential for the world's reefs, in the face of climate change, and 65% of this 'climate refuge reef' area is found in the jurisdictions of Indonesia, Philippines, Fiji, Tanzania, Solomon Islands and Madagascar.

The proposed Coral Reef Rescue GEF project will build off a global baseline, which includes identification of reef areas that are climate refuge to climate changes, knowledge and management tools developed through CCRES, MPA conservation financing, mapping and monitoring, and regional intergovernmental coordination, and a series of national baselines, which include policy, national action plans, monitoring, and actions to protect reefs through MPAs, LMMAs, and other management initiatives. Through the GEF financing and catalytic influence, this proposed project brings together the national governments, Blue Ventures, Rare, CARE International, The University of Queensland, WCS, WWF (as GEF Agency) and civil society partners to create a dedicated focus on climate change climate refuge reefs. GEF financing in this project will support global knowledge and capacity strengthening networks to share, identify, and target solutions for climate refuge reef conservation, a global platform for near to real time monitoring of coral reefs, identification of key threats to climate refuge coral reefs and participatory national strategies for reef protection, and technical assistance to mobilize public and private investments towards identified priorities, including the development of an investment portfolio of sustainable businesses that support local communities and the climate refuge reefs on which they depend.

The global and national baseline and the additional investment from the GEF will result in a dedicated focus on climate change climate refuge reefs in 6 countries, supporting the health of these climate refuge and connected reefs for global reef regeneration in the future.

Baseline	Alternative Scenario	Environmental Benefits
Component 1 - Global knowledge and capacity strengthening networks for climate refuge coral reef rescue		<p>The 6 countries (plus Cuba through co-finance) will improve their capacities to monitor, identify and better implement best available solutions to protect the most climate refuge coral reefs that can secure the regeneration of these coral reefs globally.</p> <p>Key stakeholders at the national level will have strengthened capacities to use available data and information to identify and prioritize coral reef threats and make better decisions on priority solutions for coral reef conservation, including the use of traditional knowledge in coral reef conservation.</p>
<p>There are limited knowledge sharing networks at the global level on coral reef conservation, despite the rich knowledge and existing examples of good practices globally. Currently, there are limitations (both capacity and resourcing) in standardizing reef health monitoring and impacts of threats on reefs at the global level.</p>	<p>Building on a rich baseline of knowledge and tools developed by past GEF and non GEF interventions, the project will create a global network of governmental and non-governmental practitioners, academia, and communities for sharing knowledge and good practices on coral reef conservation. The project will support a near real time coral reef monitoring platform (using a range of scales and with linkages to approaches from citizen science to advanced sampling and analysis and evaluate climate refuge coral reefs in priority sites, in near real time, providing early warnings on coral reef impacts, such as changes to water quality, coastal deforestation, mass coral bleaching and mortality and related events (seagrass and mangrove die-offs).</p>	
Component 2 - Planning for climate refuge coral reef rescue at the national level		

<p>Countries hosting climate refuge reefs lack specific strategies for their conservation and specific institutional platforms to coordinate these efforts. Very frequently, specific strategies or projects are designed without a strong science base and without considering the traditional knowledge of local communities.</p>	<p>The project will create and strengthen the capacity for multi-sectoral hubs to engage in strategic coral reef conservation in the 6 countries. Those hubs will lead and facilitate the development of science based knowledge platforms that will assist in the mapping of threat/opportunity, cost benefit analysis and spatial analysis that will feed into national strategies for the conservation of coral reefs. In parallel, the project will facilitate consultative processes with local communities related to the coral reefs, to capture traditional knowledge and be able to include it in the analysis and national strategies.</p>	<p>Countries will have secured funding for implementing priority solutions to reduce key coral reef threats and will have secured private investments towards sustainable business that will bring rapid solutions for regeneration and conservation of climate refuge coral reefs.</p>
<p>Component 3 - Financial solutions for climate refuge coral reef rescue</p>		
<p>There are multiple ongoing and planned initiatives and funding opportunities for coral reefs, both in the context of the Coral Reef Rescue Initiative and outside of it. However, countries often have difficulties accessing these funds and directing those to activities aimed at preserving coral reefs and specifically to the identified climate refuge reefs. There is insufficient involvement of the private sector in identifying and implementing solutions for coral reef conservation.</p>	<p>The project will assist countries to access public and private funding opportunities to ensure an increased financial flow towards financing priorities identified in the National Action Plans, including sustainable livelihood initiatives in communities related to climate refuge coral reefs.</p>	<p>Co-financing partners and investment opportunities generated through the project will provide on-the-ground support to these coral reefs, resulting in a variety of global benefits including better management of the coral reefs, better carbon capture from healthy corals, restoration of degraded coral reefs, and improved biodiversity from those flora and fauna that depend on healthy corals to survive.</p>

f. Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF);

Overall, the proposed project will support knowledge exchange and planning to facilitate a harmonized and informed approach for safeguarding globally significant reefs in Indonesia, Philippines, Cuba^[1], Fiji, Tanzania, Solomon Islands and Madagascar. Co-financing partners and investment opportunities generated through the project will provide on-the-ground support to these coral reefs, resulting in a variety of benefits including: conservation of key coral reef ecosystems, preserving the potential for regeneration of coral reefs at global level, better carbon capture from healthy coral reefs and associated

ecosystems, and improved biodiversity from those flora and fauna that depend on healthy corals to survive, including reef fish, that are important for local livelihoods.

The proposed project will generate global environmental benefits that will be measured through the following GEF Core Indicators, aligned with the GEF International Waters:

[GEF Core Indicator 4.1] Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Through the National Action Plans for Climate Refuge Reefs, the project will support stakeholders across a diversity of sectors and levels to come together to identify, negotiate and commit to priority actions to improve land use practices in a manner that will significantly mitigate threats to climate refuge reefs for at least 4000ha across the 6 countries (**Note ? target may be revised following the threats analysis)

[GEF Core Indicator 7.4] Level of engagement in IW: Learn through participation and delivery of key products

By year 2, a project website will be established in line with IW:LEARN guidance and by year 4, project staff and country representatives will have actively participated at International Waters Conferences as well as provided spatial data and other data points via the Knowledge Hub and Climate Data Platforms (Component 1)

Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (target, 9,850).

Through the creation of global knowledge networks, the project will increase knowledge and technical capacities of government and non-governmental actors and stakeholders (including communities, private sector, and academia) on addressing critical threats to climate refuge reefs as well as the use of data to better engage in evidence informed planning and decision making. In addition, communities and other stakeholders will be involved in training to strengthen capacities for the meaningful and inclusive engagement of local communities as well as strengthen skills and knowledge through engagement in Hub activities such as analysis and planning. Under Component 4, individuals with small and medium enterprises as well as larger businesses will be supported to strengthen their business plans and operations and better attract and engage with investors.

[1] Activities in Cuba will be financed through project co-financing sources, and not by the GEF project budget.

g. Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

Innovativeness

This project operationalizes the inclusion of climate change by identifying well connected reef regions that have a low exposure to climate change. This is novel as no other investment has strategically interwoven climate change into a decision-based system that seeks to preserve coral reefs on a global scale (Beyer et al 2018, Hoegh-Guldberg et al 2018). In this regard, the Global Coral Reef Rescue Initiative partners have adopted an innovative and novel framework to identify coral reef areas that will create a foundation for giving coral reef ecosystems, and the people they support, the best chance to remain ecologically healthy and productive.

The identification of reef sites (Bioclimatic units, Beyer et al 2018) is driven by the following objectives: a) Coral reefs refugia (these are the places most likely to provide a source of regeneration once the climate has stabilized based on Beyer et al., 2018) This analysis alone was highly innovative in that it adopted an approach developed in economics and applied portfolio theory to coral reef data allowing the selection of a portfolio of sites most likely to survive a 1.5 degree increase in temperature in the future as well as highly connected, increasing their ability to repopulate other reefs in the region; b) Those places where high dependence on coral reefs for food security and livelihoods exists (because this is where there is the most to lose and therefore the greatest urgency); c) Those places where the capacity to respond is the lowest (because this is where civil society has the greatest role to play); and d) Where local stressors threaten coral reef health (and therefore where local action can build reef resilience).

Sustainability

The project has been designed through a series of participatory workshops that have included key stakeholders in each of the participant countries. The project strategy is to create capacities in the relevant institutions and key stakeholders for coral reef restoration in the 6 countries (plus Cuba through co-financing), to be able to monitor coral reef health and identify the best solutions for tackling coral reef threats in each country. By focusing on creating capacities in competent institutions and communities at country level the project

will ensure long term sustainability. The project will address the following key parameters of sustainability:

Institutional sustainability

Through the participatory design process followed in the preparation of this project, the ownership and involvement of all key government agencies is secured. As the officially designated agencies for this area of work, participating agencies' mandates stretch beyond the period of the project, ensuring continuity. This will ensure that experiences, lessons learned, and best practices generated by the project are maintained within the communities, NGOs, and government structures. The project has broad support from a large group of governments and NGOs that are 'on the same page' on an issue that has vexed scientists and frustrated reef managers up until the present day. The National Hubs will provide a long term mechanism to all for coordinated approaches to the conservation and management of coral reefs amongst this diversity of actors and stakeholders.

Financial sustainability

The project has a specific component on financial solutions for Coral Reef rescue, to ensure increased financial flow to the national strategies, developed in Component 2, towards reducing the main threats to coral reefs in each country. Furthermore, this proposal focuses on developing sustainable livelihood pathways and sustainable private business portfolios (to relieve the

pressure on coral reefs and offer sustainable and alternative sources of income and livelihoods, attracting impact investment). The project will support the enactment of essential enabling conditions for both public and private finance mechanisms to contribute to coral reef resilience through direct sustainable financing and through better alignment of private and public interests.

Social sustainability

The engagement of non-governmental stakeholders, including communities and the private sector is a key factor in assuring the long-term sustainability of GEF investments. In this regard, under Component 2, the project will place special emphasis on ensuring the participation of these two stakeholder groups in national stakeholder platforms, the National Hubs, for the development of the national strategies for coral reef conservation. Special attention will be placed to ensure national strategies capture traditional knowledge for coral reef conservation from local communities.

Sustainable and gender responsive livelihood pathways and private business opportunities will be identified, to ensure incentives and benefit sharing systems, that are crucial for the long-term engagement of local communities and the private sector.

Project strategies for Scaling up

Replication and diffusion

The project has a strong approach on knowledge management to ensure sharing of best practices for coral reef monitoring and conservation. Successful local scale innovations will be replicated in other sites where such an intervention may also be successful. Successful models can also be replicated through diffusion of ideas through facilitating cross learning between these communities and the global knowledge networks under Component 1 and through IW Learn. The GCF has also been supportive of WWF's efforts to develop CRRI projects in Solomon Islands and Fiji, currently under preparation. The GCF CRRI projects will focus on complementary components to the GEF Program, leveraging its important lessons learned, including the leveraging of regulatory frameworks enabling land and marine use planning, the use and further improvement of learning networks for practitioners, and the implementation of financial services to incentivize coral conservation.

Scaling up through unlocking resources

To unlock resources to enable an on-ground response to support reefs and dependent communities? successful transition to a new climate regime.

The project will provide technical assistance to support countries to unlock public financial resources towards the implementation of national strategies to reduce coral reef threats. The project will also support local stakeholders

to develop an investment portfolio of business cases that blend both public and private sector finance, aligned to the reef resilience strategies. Through the thorough analytical and future-oriented approach described above, the project will build the confidence of both public and private sector investors that they are likely to see social, environmental as well as financial returns on their investments while the use of blended finance will assist in mitigating the financial risk. The project will explore options for using existing and/or building new investment vehicles that can support return generating activities that protect coral reefs. Additionally, the proposed GCF projects will draw significantly from the ground setting established by the CRR GEF project, especially on the feasibility and viability assessments of sustainable financial products and services to incentivize coral reef protection, which will unlock resources to implement the business portfolio developed under the CRR GEF project.

Scaling through shifting the mindsets of the public and key policy makers

To highlight the implications of coral reef loss for economies and human well-being through political champions in contexts where the effects are most felt to enable scaling up through unlocking in key policy commitments to motivate on ground action.

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

This project, CRR GEF, will work in 6 of the 7 countries^[1] where climate refuge coral reefs are concentrated - Philippines, Solomon Islands, Fiji, Indonesia, Tanzania, and Madagascar. This project is focused around establishing critical capacities and conditions in these countries to enable effective on the ground conservation action and future investments, for example from the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which will be sequenced to follow implementation of the CRR GEF project. Therefore, site based interventions are primarily for planning and prioritization purposes, including the following:

- ? Supporting communities to discuss, debate and develop their vision and priorities to inform the national action plans for climate refuge reefs (Components 1 & 2)
- ? Carrying out studies (threat/opportunity and cost-benefit analysis) (Component 2)
- ? Gathering data and information, including community perspectives to inform the identification of potential reef-friendly businesses and investment opportunities (Component 3), and
- ? Supporting communities to generate narratives, capture and share their values, histories, and experiences with regards to climate refuge reefs

Given the wide geographic scope of BCUs and limitations in resources, the following areas within the BCUs were prioritized used shared criteria (described in section 1.1. of the project document). Maps of the priority areas are included in the Annexes.


Country	Prioritised BCUs	Areas identified as priorities by stakeholders [2] ²
Indonesia	BCU 11 Bird's Head	Maluku province
	BCU 35 East Nusa Tenggara	East Nusa Tenggara province
	BCU 43 Makassar	South Sulawesi province
	BCU 13 Singapore/Riau Islands	Riau Archipelago province
Solomon Islands (Central & Eastern Province Sites)	BCU 42 Solomon Islands	Central Island Province
		Malaita Province
		Isabel Province
		Temotu
Fiji (Great Sea Reefscape)	BCU 52 Vanua-I- Ra BCU 61 Vanua Balavu	Macuata Province
		Ra Province
		Ba Province
Philippines	BCU 20 Central and Southern Palawan	Municipalities: Aborlan, Narra, Sofronio, Espaniola, Brookespoint, Bataraza, Balabac, Rizal and Quezon
Tanzania	BCU 24 Southern Tanzania	Rufiji-Mafia-Kilwa Seascape

Country	Prioritised BCUs	Areas identified as priorities by stakeholders [2] ²
	BCU 25 Central Tanzania	Tanga/N/Unguja (Zanzibar) Seascape PECCA/Pangani Seascape
Madagascar	BCU 30 Northern Madagascar	Nosy Iranja MPA Nosy Hara MPA Loky Bay area

[1] The 7th country is Cuba. Activities in Cuba will be financed through other sources, not by the GEF project budget, WWF US or any other US funds.

[2] Priority areas were identified by stakeholders using only the criteria described earlier. Consequently, scales and proportionate sizes of the priority areas differ from one country to another.


Fiji Map:




Solomon Islands Map:




Indonesia Maps:







Philippines Map:



Madagascar Map:



Tanzania Map:



1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

The strategy for stakeholder engagement during execution is detailed in the project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Annex 6. This plan may be reviewed at the onset of implementation and will periodically take into consideration the lessons and experiences emerging from the project as well as to enable the project to respond to changes in the external context (such as the COVID situation in the country).

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement is a fundamental strategy of the project, enabled primarily by the National Hubs which provide the space and mechanisms for meaningful engagement by local communities, private sector, development partners, non-governmental organizations, and governmental agencies across all four components of the project. The composition of National Hubs in each country is described in Annex 4. Responsibility for ensuring inclusive and meaningful engagement of stakeholders in each country lies with the NTFs, and will be implemented in accordance with official guidance with regards to social distancing due to COVID-19 safety protocols. Through the National Hubs, stakeholders will be involved in annual reflection meetings which will allow for shared learning with the outcomes of these meetings to inform progress reports and the development of annual workplans. Stakeholders will also contribute to design of specific activities (for example, developing and/or reviewing ToRs), review, comment and sign off on outputs as well as participate in the delivery of selected activities and outputs through the Technical Working Groups. Project design places emphasis on the involvement of local communities that have an impact on or are impacted by climate refuge coral reefs. Under Component 2, resources are allocated to support communities in defining their visions and aspirations for climate refuge reefs, which will influence the national vision and action plans for climate refuge reefs as well as the investment portfolios which will be developed under Component 3. In Component 4, communities are supported to share their narratives, histories, and realities around climate refuge reefs through the communication and awareness raising activities.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment.

Gender Assessment (Summary)

In accordance with the GEFs Policy on Gender Mainstreaming and the Gender Equality Action Plan, which recognized that a more systematic inclusion of gender aspects in projects could create positive synergies between improved environmental impact and greater gender equality, a high-level gender desk review was conducted to inform and guide the development of the Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities project. The countries' gender profiles are based on a desk review of literature, including reports and research conducted at national level and interviews/conversations with gender experts at the national and regional level. This involved an assessment for each country on the mandates and frameworks on gender, the national context in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment, and gender considerations in the use, conservation, and management of coastal and marine resources.

There are significant and important differences between the roles, rights realized and opportunities available for women and men in the six countries where the project is proposing to work. These include, among others: differences concerning land and resource rights, access to goods, services and financial resources, gender-based violence and spaces to participate in and influence decision-making processes. The gender analysis also showed that inequality between men and women in the six countries is ingrained in socio-cultural norms. Gender can often strongly predict how an individual can be meaningfully engaged in resource-management programs and decision-making, and how those programs might positively or negatively impact that individual. Existing gendered power imbalances in coastal and marine decision-making and resource ownership specifically affect women's capacity to influence change and expand their roles in managing and safeguarding coastal and marine resources. It is also crucial to recognize that women and men may have divergent understandings of the use and management of natural resources or traditional knowledge about biodiversity and ecosystems.

Gender action plan for project execution (summary)

A gender responsive Gender Action Plan has been developed for the Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities project. The detailed plan, found in Annex 1 of the project document, includes gender-specific actions for outputs delivered by the project from year 1 through year 4 of project implementation. It is a useful tool for project implementation as it provides gender-specific indicators and targets for each year, as well as information on who is responsible for ensuring these targets are achieved. The plan demonstrates that the project recognizes and acknowledges gender norms and inequalities and will respond to them through actions and initiatives to address women and men's different needs, constraints, and opportunities. A gender-responsive approach ensures that

women and men's different needs are addressed; that participation of women and men is equitable; and that distribution of benefits, resources, status, and rights are equitably addressed. The Gender Action Plan was developed around the idea that successful use, management, and conservation of coastal and marine resources requires that both women and men have equal access to opportunities and the ability to participate in, and benefit from, the project initiatives.

A detailed Gender Action Plan can be found in Annex 1 of the project document that links outputs with tangible activities to promote gender inclusion, equality, and equity. The Gender Action Plan was developed with the following objectives.

1. Structure inclusive and gender-sensitive project teams with capacities and technical expertise to support gender-responsive action. This might require providing staff with basic training on gender dimensions specific to the project to increase understanding and capacity on gender mainstreaming for implementation.
2. Ensure equality of voice and influence by women and men in all aspects of the project[1], using culturally sensitive and appropriate approaches
3. Ensure that women and women's organizations are represented in any stakeholder consultation.
4. Ensures that the roles, needs, skills, and vulnerabilities of women and men are equally recognized.
5. Promote equal rights to access and derive benefits from the use, management, and conservation of coastal and marine resources.
6. Support the full, equal, and effective engagement of women and men in decision-making and all action related to developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the project.
7. Ensure project activities, both in-person and virtual, are accessible to women, considering location, timing, transportation constraints, household responsibilities, permission from a male family member(s), access to computers, phones, and internet, etc. which may affect their ability to attend/participate in project activities.
8. Provide adequate resources- both expertise and financial- to support the development and implementation of gender-responsive interventions.
9. Ensure that the results framework is gender-sensitive along with a comprehensive sex-disaggregated data collection
10. Furthermore, due to the nature of this project, it will depend to a great extent on the establishment of task forces, panels, workshops, and meetings. Therefore, the project will embrace the principle of no male-only panels

[1] Including external communication ? for example, by ensuring that panels involve both women and men

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

Private sector engagement is a core part of the design of the project at two levels: i) Engagement in overall planning, monitoring, and learning processes for both the delivery of the project as well as conservation and management of climate refuge reefs more broadly as members of the National Hubs (Component 2); and ii) Direct engagement in strengthening financial solutions for climate refuge coral reef rescue under Component 3.

Under Component 2, Countries have identified companies and businesses that have an impact on coral reefs (positive and negative) that are to be invited to become members of the National Hubs. These include, for example, Matanataki, a Fiji-based private sector partnership of business developers, finance experts, conservationists and creatives who work together to support the development of green and blue businesses; the National Fisheries Developments Ltd in Solomon Islands that supplies fish to its sister company, which is the only tuna processor facility, SolTuna and Tour operators in Madagascar. The full list is provided in Annex 4. Additional businesses and companies to be engaged in the National Hubs will be identified following the threat/opportunity, cost/benefit and scoping analysis, which will inform the project which sectors need to be prioritized in order to maximize the probability of success of the National Action Plans for Climate Refuge Coral Reefs (developed under Component 2 through the National Hubs). The engagement of private sector in the National Hubs is critical as a key function of the Hubs will be to enable stakeholders and sectors that rely on or impact climate refuge coral reefs to identify, discuss and negotiate solutions that are synergistic, reconciling conservation, development and economic outcomes and aspirations at multiple levels.

In Component 3, the project will identify at least 100 existing and potential reef-friendly sustainable businesses and options for business expansion and scale up through private and blended finance. Priority will be placed on reef-positive small and medium sized businesses that create sustainable livelihood opportunities and community-centered enterprises. The focus will be on enabling a shift from conventional business models that treat damage to coral reefs as an externality, to business models that align to sustainable blue economy finance principles. Examples include the adoption of sustainable fisheries and aquaculture practices, ecotourism, circulate waste management, regenerative agriculture, sustainable forest management and coastal and reef restoration.

The project will work closely with the shortlisted businesses, providing technical advisory support to help them to further improve their potential positive impact on coral reefs and improve their business planning to reach a stage where they can attract investments. The project will identify and make linkages between potential investors, potential product 'off-takers' and the businesses short-listed and receiving technical advisory support. In particular, activities under Component 3 are design to align with and complement potential support for the CRRRI from the Global Fund for Coral Reefs (GFCR), a blended finance vehicle which provides concessional or commercial debt and equity financing in reef-friendly businesses. In addition, the project will also identify and establish relationships with larger businesses within economic sectors driving coral reef degradation (identified through the threats/opportunity and cost-benefit analysis). The project will work with these businesses to identify opportunities for investment in their operations and supply chains to reduce their impacts (or enhance positive impacts on coral reefs). This may include, for example, working with large scale agricultural farms to reduce runoff of pesticides and fertilizers or adjust grazing regimes to minimize the impact surface water runoff as a result of soil compaction and infiltration.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

#	Identified risk	Potential consequence	Counter measure
2	High turnover of staff members in executing agencies.	This could lead to a loss of institutional knowledge regarding project interventions, and less effective implementation.	The University of Queensland International Development Team will be executing the project as a unit, if one member of the team were to transition off the project, the UQID Team would have capacity and knowledge to compensate for this. A knowledge management platform will be developed to facilitate the transfer of knowledge regarding project interventions.
3	Insufficient financial resources limit the implementation of investments on the ground needed to ensure coral reef conservation measures and sustainable livelihood activities.	National Action Plans for Coral Reef Rescue not implemented because of lack of funds.	The project will include a specific output for providing technical assistance to countries to secure private and public funding for their national coral reef strategies. The national strategies will include a sustainable finance strategy.

4	Low participation and support from key stakeholders due to competing personal priorities, inappropriate project activities, or a limited understanding of the value and importance for coral reef conservation.	If there is limited uptake by stakeholders or if they cease to implement project interventions after the project lifetime, it will result in continued unsustainable land use and management practices in the landscape.	Stakeholders will be actively involved in the design, development, and implementation processes of the project, through a bottom-up approach. Awareness will be raised on the negative impacts for local communities and national economies from the loss of coral reef. Demonstrative projects on sustainable livelihoods for coral reef communities will demonstrate sustainable models compatible with coral reef conservation and economic development.
5	Capacity constraints of local and national institutions to undertake the required project interventions.	Project interventions could be delayed and there may be insufficient capacity to overcome potential implementation challenges.	The project has a strong approach on knowledge management, learning and, in general, strengthening capacities of national institutions and will be designed considering existing institutional capacities.
6	Political instability and conflict	Project interventions may be delayed during periods of instability and conflict, should they arise	To the extent possible, the PMU will support NTFs. However, mitigation will depend on the level of severity of the conflict.

Climate Change Risk Analysis

Country	Climate Change Risk	Impacts on Coasts and Reef	How Is the Project Addressing This?
---------	---------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

Country	Climate Change Risk	Impacts on Coasts and Reef	How Is the Project Addressing This?
Solomon Islands	<p>Germanwatch's Long-Term Climate Risk Index (1998-2017) rated Solomon Island as the 27th most at-risk country in the world.[1]</p> <p>Climate change risks in the Solomon Islands include increasing annual average temperatures, escalating storm intensity, rising sea levels, and ocean acidification. Category 4 and 5 storms have more than doubled since 1990, contributing to the Solomon Islands' vulnerability to climate change. Flooding as a result of storms and increased rainfall has also worsened on the islands. Average temperatures across the South Pacific, (encompassing the Solomon Islands) have increased by approximately 1°C since 1970, making the average rate of increase 0.3°C per decade. Flooding and increased temperatures cause sea-levels to rise. Between 1994 and 2008, sea levels in SI rose by 7.6mm, almost double the global average, with projections that sea level rise will be three times the global average.[2]</p>	Climate change risks such as floods, storm damage and sea level rise all cause a loss of productivity and threaten reef-dependent livelihoods. In the Solomon Islands, average asset losses due natural disasters are estimated to be more than \$44 million.	This project will support the creation of national strategies for climate-climate refuge reef conservation and in turn, protect reef systems that are part of Large Marine Ecosystems. Reef systems protect Coastal communities from storm surge and wave damage which have become more present in the face of rising sea levels and more frequent storms.

Country	Climate Change Risk	Impacts on Coasts and Reef	How Is the Project Addressing This?
Indonesia ^[3]	<p>The World Bank conducted a global analysis and ranked Indonesia 12th out of 35 countries that face high mortality risk from multiple climate hazards.^[4]⁴ Indonesia faces climate risks in the form of increased temperatures, flooding because of precipitation changes, and sea-level rise.</p> <p>Since 1990, the mean annual temperature in Indonesia has increased by about 0.3°C. Temperatures are projected to increase by approximately 0.2-0.3°C per decade. Varying precipitation patterns have demonstrated an increase in rainfall during the wet season, which will lead to an increase in flooding. Sumatra and Borneo are projected to become 10-30% wetter by the 2080s, but with this increased rainfall projected to occur later in the crop season. ^[5]⁵ Flooding will continue to increase during La Nina climate events which are also becoming more severe due to climate change.</p>	<p>Regions within Indonesia's islands that are most vulnerable to climate change risks are Java, Sulawesi and the southeastern Papua islands. These regions all face increased incidences of drought, floods, landslides, and sea-level rise.</p> <p>70% of the reefs located in Indonesia are already suffering damage from climate change risks. Wildlife within the reef systems account for 60% of the population's protein intake. This demonstrates how critically vulnerable the livelihoods and health of communities are as the coastal zones continue to degrade. ^[6]⁶</p>	<p>This project will support communities that depend on the coastal reef systems by using appropriate measures to increase understanding and awareness of reef protection, as well as planning for coral reef protection at the national level.</p>

Country	Climate Change Risk	Impacts on Coasts and Reef	How Is the Project Addressing This?
Fiji	<p>Germanwatch's Long-Term Climate Risk Index (1998-2017) rated Fiji as the 20th most at-risk country in the world.^[7] This ranking demonstrates that Fiji is highly susceptible to climate risks such as floods, sea level rise, ocean acidification, warming sea temperatures and cyclones.</p> <p>Flooding of the river systems in Fiji has become more frequent and is usually triggered by extreme weather events, including La Nina and El Nino events. ^[8] Sea level rise has affected Fiji more than most of the globe. The average global sea level rise is 2.8-3.6mm annually, whereas Fiji's Annual average increase was approximately 6mm per year since 1993. Rising temperatures in Fiji, demonstrated in daily maximum temperatures, have increased and average of .1°C per decade for the past 50 years. ^[9]</p>	<p>Fiji's 2017 Climate Vulnerability Assessment estimated that average losses due to extreme flooding events and damaging storms were around \$500 million annually.</p> <p>Within the provinces around the Great Sea Reef in Fiji, 40% of the population directly depend on the coastal reef system for protection against climate risk events. Sea-Level rise and other climate change events disrupt the natural processes and activities of reef systems and tidal flats. These areas provide habitats for fisheries and are critical for the Fijians that rely on them for their livelihoods.</p>	<p>This project, through increased monitoring and the creation of national strategies for conservation will facilitate improvement of the health of local reef systems. Healthier reefs help protect Fijians against climate risk events physically (as reefs protect coastal communities by weakening storm surges and wave damage) and economically (because communities depend on coastal resources for their livelihoods).</p>

Country	Climate Change Risk	Impacts on Coasts and Reef	How Is the Project Addressing This?
The Philippines	<p>The Philippines faces similar climate change threats as other island nations such as Indonesia and Solomon Islands. The largest threats to the Philippines are increasing temperatures, storm occurrences and precipitation, leading to more floods.</p> <p>Like in other island countries, La Niña events trigger a more erratic precipitation pattern and correlate closely with flooding events. With a rise in frequency of severe storms and climate events, the number of rainy days in the Philippines has increased overall since the 1990s. Between 1971 and 2000, the mean annual temperature increased by 0.14°C, with a higher rate of increase occurring after the 1970s.^[10]¹⁰</p>	<p>The Philippines faces an unprecedented number of cyclones, storm surges, floods, and sea-level rise, all exacerbated by the amount of foreign aid the country depends on. These natural disasters and the rising sea level causes damage to the reef systems and coastal mangroves, having detrimental effects on people and their economic stability. 74% of the country's population is exposed to multiple climate threats at any given time. ^[11]¹¹</p>	<p>This project will help The Philippines address the impacts of climate change by making an array of tools available to communities. These tools and multi-country platforms will provide support and information to aid in managing and utilizing coral reefs and associated ecosystems for protection and sustenance.</p>

Country	Climate Change Risk	Impacts on Coasts and Reef	How Is the Project Addressing This?
Tanzania and Madagascar	<p>The West Indian Ocean has been identified as a global 'hot-spot' for climate change, affecting all countries bordering this ocean. Tanzania and Madagascar are experiencing climate change risks in the form of changes in rainfall patterns resulting in floods, increase in cyclone events, sea-level rise, increasing temperatures and changes in current movements.</p> <p>Precipitation patterns have become more erratic in Tanzania and Madagascar and can result in heavy river flows which cause flooding. Changes in the El Niño Southern Oscillation and the Indian Ocean Dipole can also cause flooding. These events lead to sediment input, soil erosion and run-off into nearshore marine habitats ultimately causing degradation of coastal zones. Sea-level rise in the Indian Ocean around Madagascar and Tanzania has been recorded to be three times that of the global average, increasing as much as 10mm per year. Regional currents such as the Agulhas Current system have been warming because of abnormally high trade wind speeds that are linked to storm systems. The current system has warmed by 1.5°C since the 1980s. [12]¹² The Indian Ocean has seen a mean temperature increase of 1°C since 1950.</p>	Climate and weather-related changes to current systems could greatly impact the productivity of the coastal reefs and fisheries within those areas. Coupled with floods and an increase in cyclone or storm activity, the surrounding communities are highly vulnerable to climate change risks. The communities most at risk are those dependent on fisheries, aquaculture, and ecosystem services.	Coastal Reef systems will benefit from the increased community involvement that this project will support. Communities will aid in monitoring the reefs and build capacity in management and protection of coastal zones. Stakeholders will learn how to access and utilize information and data gathered from a global platform, while national strategies will be created to govern future conservation efforts.

COVID-19 Risk Analysis

Risk category	Potential Risk	Mitigations and Plans
Availability of technical expertise and capacity and changes in timelines	Continued or renewed efforts in COVID-19 containment are likely over the course of project implementation.	The project will continue to draw on remote working tools to support and engage with teams (building on experiences gained over the last two years). This includes the use of virtual communication tools and platforms such as mural, miro, conceptboard etc.
	It is anticipated that for some countries it will be difficult to access government capacity while they are focused on COVID-19 containment or recovery. This is true for most of the project countries, especially Philippines and Indonesia, but also for Fiji and Solomon Islands where additional factors affect connectivity and availability of staff (e.g., cyclones).	<p>Relevant government agencies were closely involved during PPG and expressed support for this project to move forward despite the challenges that COVID-19 has brought to these countries.</p> <p>In addition, a key criterion for the selection of NTFs is a well-established presence in the country with positive relationships with the relevant government agencies. NTFs will continue to work closely in country with governments with support from the WWF country offices. This will ensure that the project is aware of the realities of each country and enable the teams to work with the guidance of government and other stakeholders to adapt and adjust as required to realize intended outcomes.</p>
Stakeholder engagement process	COVID-19 restrictions may limit abilities to effectively engage with stakeholders ? particularly local communities (as a result of, for example, travel restrictions)	<p>Local level consultation will only be undertaken in compliance with national to local government guidelines and the Lead executing agencies guidelines. This may involve, for example, ensuring that meetings involve small group sizes, the use of rapid testing, and PPEs.</p> <p>Additionally, the PMU will develop guidance on COVID protocols to be adapted for use in each country and required for National Hubs.</p> <p>In all cases, continued attention will be given to ensuring the voices of IP, women, youth, and any underrepresented community members.</p>

Future risks of similar crises.	It is possible that COVID-19 impacts lead more people to move to rural areas, including areas around the project reef sites, and this may add more pressure to resources there.	This potential increased pressure to climate refuge coral reefs will be taken into consideration during the threat analysis carried out under activity 2.2.1 and will inform priority measures in the national action plans.
---------------------------------	---	--

[1] Kreft, S?nke, David Eckstein, and Inga Melchior Global Climate Risk Index 2017. (2016). Bonn: Germanwatch e.V. <https://germanwatch.org/en/cri>.

[2] GFDRR, 2011. Solomon Islands Climate Change and Disaster Risk Profile.

[3] Hulme, M and N. Sheard. 1999. Climate Change Scenarios for Indonesia. Climatic Research Unit, Norwich, UK, 6 pp

[4] World Bank, 2005. Natural Disaster Hotspots, A Global Risk Analysis. Washington, DC: Disaster Risk Management Series.

[5] USAID Indonesia, 2008. Conservation of Tropical Forests and Biological Diversity In Indonesia. Report submitted in accordance with Foreign Assistance Act Sections 118/119.

[6] WRI, 2001. World Resources 2000-2001: People and Ecosystems: The Fraying Web of Life.

[7] 1

[8] Harris et al., 2014: Updated high-resolution grids of monthly climatic observations ? CRU TS3.10: The Climatic Research Unit (CRU) Time Series (TS) Version 3.10 Dataset, Int. J. Climatology, 34(3), 623-642, doi: 10.1002/joc3711; updated from previous version of CRU TS3.xx

[9] Federated states of Micronesia, Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 2014

[10] Folland, C.K., J.A. Renwick, M.J. Salinger, N. Jiang, and N.A. Rayner, 2003: Trends and variations in South Pacific Islands and ocean surface temperatures. Journal of Climate., 16, 2859-2874 and Folland, C.K., J.A. Renwick, M.J. Salinger, and A.B. Mullan, 2002: Relative influences of the Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation and ENSO on the South Pacific Convergence. Zone. Geophysical Research Letters, 29, 21-1-21-4

[11] GFDRR Country Profile for the Philippines

[12] Union of Comoros, France, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania, A Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for Sustainable Management of the Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystems. ASCLME.org, 2014

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional Arrangements

Institutional arrangements are designed to allow for efficient and effective delivery at national and global levels for this project while putting in place sustainable structures for continuity in management and coordination as new investments are mobilized and new initiatives come on board. These structures are aimed at enabling strong partnerships amongst national partners as well as Global CRRI partners[1].


The GEF CRR project will be supported and guided by the CRRRI[2] Global Core Team which includes: the Global Initiative Leader, Coordinator/manager, Social Science Lead, Gender specialist, M&E Lead and a Partnerships and Outreach Lead. The Global Core Team oversees the implementation of CRRRI at the global level, ensuring that all sub-programmes (including this GEF CRR project) contribute strategically to the realization of the initiatives overall vision and objectives. The Global CRRRI partners will also engage in guiding and supporting the GEF CRR project as participants of the Global Project Steering Committee as well as of the National Hubs in countries where they have presence.

Figure 12 provides an illustrative overview of the core structures, funding and reporting flows which are described in more detail below.

[1] Global CRRRI Partners are: Blue Ventures, Rare, CARE International, The University of Queensland, WCS, and WWF

[2] The Global Coral Reef Rescue Initiative described in Section 1, Box 1.

Figure 1 proposed institutional arrangements



WWF GEF Agency

WWF-US, through its WWF GEF Agency, is the GEF Project Agency for this project and will: (i) provide consistent and regular project oversight to ensure the achievement of project objectives and Results Framework, and provide other assistance upon request of the Lead Executing Agency; (ii) liaise between

the project and the GEF Secretariat; (iii) ensure that both GEF and WWF policy requirements and standards are applied and met (i.e. reporting obligations, technical, fiduciary, monitoring and evaluation-M&E); (iv) approve work-plans and budget revisions, certify fund availability and transfer funds and ensure proper use of GEF funds; (v) organize the final evaluation and review project audits; and (vi) certify project operational and financial completion; and (vii) arbitrate and ensure resolution of any conflicts during implementation that cannot be resolved in first instance by the EA.

Lead Executing Agency - University of Queensland

The project executing entities listed at PIF stage were the Global Coral Reef Rescue Partnership (University of Queensland, CARE International, RARE, WCS, Blue Ventures, WWF, and Vulcan) ; the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, Tanzania; Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology, Solomon Islands; Ministry of Environment, Fiji; Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Madagascar; Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines; Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF), Indonesia.

As stated in the PIF, during project development, the University of Queensland (UQ) was selected to be the Project Lead Executing Agency as the most suitable entity to execute this project for its management capacity and mandate. The University of Queensland will host the Project Management Unit (PMU) at the University of Queensland International Department.

As described in Section 2.2., UQ will be also in charge of delivering Component 1 and providing assistance to the delivery of Component 2 and 3. Budget for this role is presented in Section 2.8.2 Executing agency costs (Component 1).


The Project Management Unit (PMU)

The Project Management Unit will reside within the University of Queensland International Development unit (UQID). UQID is one of the leading university development groups in the Asia-Pacific region, providing technical advisory services, capacity development training programs and specialised project management services for projects funded through a range of multilateral donor agencies, government aid organisations and the private sector globally. In delivering its extensive range of project management services, UQID draws on an agile team of Project Managers, Senior Development Coordinators, Development Coordinators and Development Assistants. The unit provides a range of inputs from project establishment and contracting; client and stakeholder liaison; project planning and implementation; reporting, quality assurance; monitoring and evaluation services; financial management and reporting; budget control and risk management. UQID dedicates members of its team to undertake project management responsibilities and resources each project with dedicated personnel for the various functions and inputs required subject to the project design and contractual requirements. As required, UQID will draw on resourcing from the broader UQ community, its partners, and networks to ensure projects are correctly resourced and efficiently managed. As shown in the Organisational Structure below, UQID engages relevant experts, Team Leaders and Project Personnel as necessary per project. UQID also manages all contracting, coordinating, monitoring of deliverables and payment for all service providers; project personnel; sub-contractors and other inputs required for successful project implementation. UQID works extensively with UQ's central Legal, Finance and Human Resource services to provide specialist services as needed.

UQID will be responsible for the administration of the GEF funds channeled through WWF-GEF, including the recruitment of consultancies and management of third-party contracts. UQID will sign a Grant Agreement with the WWF GEF Agency and, in turn, will subgrant to National Technical Facilitators (NTF) in each of the 6 project countries. UQID will be responsible for the strategic guidance, operational direction, and overall supervision of the NTFs, ensuring its performance is aligned with GEF and the GEF CRR project document. UQID will be also responsible for preparation and submission of technical and financial reports and coordinating external audits.

Responsibilities and tasks will be assigned to dedicated project personnel recruited specifically for this project or available from within the UQID team of experts. The structure of the proposed PMU (Figure 13) and its role are outlined below.

Figure 2 CRR PMU STRUCTURE



Identified key roles for the CRR PMU will include the following roles as outlined below together with relevant TORS/Role Descriptions:

Project Manager Role ? Terms of Reference/Role Description

The GEF CRR Project Manager is responsible for the day-to-day coordination and oversight of the project, ensuring that the project realizes its overall goals and objectives in accordance with the approved project document, work plans and budgets. This includes supervision of Project Management Unit (PMU) staff,

coordination of agreements, supervision and monitoring of National Technical Facilitators, and day-to-day management of project activities. The project manager will maintain collaborative relationships with project partners, National Technical Facilitators (NTFs), and WWF Country offices, as well as the Coral Reef Rescue Initiative (CRR) core team and CRR global partners. The Project Manager will report to the Lead Executing Agency (UQID) to WWF GEF Agency on behalf of the Project Management Unit, the CRR Leader and will report and serve as the secretary of the Project Steering Committee.

Finance and Operations Manager Role Terms of Reference/Role Description

Under the direction of the GEF CRR Project Manager, manage all financial and operational aspects of the Project including project budgeting, contracting, subrecipient monitoring and evaluations, financial tracking and reporting, and administrative functions. Provides financial and administrative assistance to, and oversight of, program staff and grantees to ensure that budgets and agreements are handled in accordance with WWF policies, procedures, systems, and donor requirements. The financial manager will have oversight of budgets in each of the 6 countries with close collaboration with the National Technical Facilitators. This position will be funded with co-financing.

Monitoring and Evaluation Officer Role

Under the direction of the GEF CRR Project Manager, the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer will be responsible for all M&E activities including tracking and reporting project implementation against project work plans and reporting progress towards outcome indicator targets. The M&E Officer will coordinate M&E processes across countries and National Technical Facilitators, ensure a shared understanding of M&E requirements, timely collection of information, progress report preparation and submission and ensure that M&E supports learning and adaptive management. The M&E Officer will maintain the overall M&E system of the project and will assist the Project Manager in preparing quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reports on project progress. Through the collection and analysis of high quality and timely data inputs (and gender disaggregated as required in the results framework), the M&E Officer is responsible for ensuring that the project maintains strategic vision and that activities result in the achievement of intended outputs and outcomes in a cost effective and timely manner, as well as contributing to project team discussions of potential opportunities for adaptive management. The M&E officer is also responsible for ensuring that the implementation of the stakeholder engagement plans and gender action plan is monitored and reported on and any challenges that may arise during implementation are brought to the attention of the PMU, Global and National Steering Committees.

The Global Project Steering Committee

The Global Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be the highest decision-making authority for the project, responsible for supervising and monitoring the technical and financial execution of the project, including the fulfilment of project objectives, activities, and goals, approving annual work plans and budgets, project reports, and financial audit reports, among others. The PSC will be responsible for strategic guidance and approving any major changes that may be needed in the strategic plans or execution of the project, informed by the project monitoring and evaluation outcomes, and ensuring alignment with the ProDoc and national priorities and policies.

The PSC will meet at least twice a year (with at least one face to face meeting during the life of the project). Members of the PSC will include the chairs of the National Steering Committees and representatives of the Global CRR Partners. A representative of the WWF GEF Agency and a Scientific Advisor from UQ will also participate as observers. As the Secretary of the PSC, the Project Manager

prepares meeting minutes and maintains PSC records. The Project Manager will also take responsibility for communicating outcomes and decision made by the Global Steering Committee to the National Hubs through the National Steering Committees. PSC Chair and Vice-chair positions will be filled by PSC members on an annual rotative basis. During the first year, the PSC will be chaired by WWF CRRI and vice-chaired by a government representative.

Chair (rotative basis):

- CRRI WWF (first year)

Vice-chair (rotative basis):

- Government representative

Secretary:

- PMU - Project Manager

Members:

- Chairs of the National Steering Committees
- CRRI Global Partners
- WWF GEF Agency representative (observer)
- UQ Scientific Advisor (observer)

Function, Roles and Responsibilities:

- Highest decision-making authority for the project.
- Promotes and champions principles of good governance, accountability, equity and inclusion in the Project management.
- Supervises technical and financial execution of the project.
- Ensures that the project is aligned with the PRODOC and national priorities and policies.
- Provides overall strategic guidance.
- Approves the Annual Operating Plan, budget, and financial audit reports.
- Makes high-level decisions regarding project structure, coordination, and implementation.
- Approves major changes to the project strategy.
- Evaluates project performance, including the project's mid-term review.
- Project Manager acts as PSC Secretary, preparing meeting minutes, and maintains the PSC records.
- Meets at least twice a year.

The National Technical Facilitators (NTFs)

The National Technical Facilitator (NTFs) will be the project managers and administrators, subgranted by the Lead Executing Agency, the University of Queensland International Development Unit (UQID). The NTFs will be responsible for the provision of technical advice, coordination, and financial management of the project activities within each country. The NTF will serve as the Secretariat to the National Hubs, reporting to the National Steering Committee. They will report technically and financially to the PMU at UQID.

NTFs will be identified through an open bidding process at the onset of implementation. Organizations eligible for applying for the role of NTF include CRRI partners that have a presence in the country for which they are applying (Blue Ventures, Care, Rare, WCS, Vulcan), Government Ministries, or other organizations which meet the selection criteria outlined in the NTF TORs (See Annex 5). If an organization can demonstrate sufficient capacity and experience in more than one country, they may apply

in multiple countries. Preference will be given to a CCRI partner that has a presence in the country. Annex 5 includes detailed criteria for selection of the NTFs.

At the request of country governments, the NTF will coordinate the implementation of national project activities with a Project National Director (PND). The PND will be a public servant designated by the government, in charge of supervision and follow up of project activities at the government level. Other technical staff could be designated by the government to perform other technical duties in the context of the project.

To ensure the selection process is transparent and consistent across countries, the Project Management Unit, hosted by The University of Queensland International Development Unit (UQID), will be responsible for conducting the NTF selection process. The NTFs will be identified through open procedure, inviting interested organizations to submit applications which will be reviewed for selection by the lead executing agency, UQID.

Governments will be informed and advised of the selection process in advance in each country and feedback taken into consideration in the finalization of the process. UQID will advise the Government and WWF focal points of the candidate organizations receiving the highest scores and feedback will be taken into consideration prior to finalization of the selection process.

National Hubs

National Hubs, formed under Component 2 (refer also to Section 2.3.6) will be the core mechanism for stakeholder engagement in the project. The Hubs will comprise of representatives of civil society, government, private sector, and non-governmental organizations from different sectors at both national and local levels (including a member of the CRRRI partnership). The stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement process carried out during PPG was used to guide the composition of the National Hubs, described in Annex 4. Members will be engaged in the delivery of the project through Technical Working Groups, through which they will contribute to the development of terms of reference for technical outputs, procurement of consultants, design of the methodology for studies (where appropriate), review and approval of outputs.

Members of the National Hubs will participate in review and reflection of project progress and performance, drawing out and sharing lessons learned during the annual reflection meetings, and using this reflection to identify priorities and recommendations for the project annual workplans as well as changes to the overall strategy that may be necessary to ensure that the overall objective and outcomes are realized.

Under the Global Steering Committee, the National Hubs Steering Committees provide strategic guidance and oversight to the project at the national level, ensuring that the project and the National Hub have high level support and standing within the country, taking responsibility for signing off on annual workplans and budgets before they are submitted to the PMU as well as supporting the NTF and members of the National Hub in problem solving and addressing challenges that may arise. They will be chaired by the host Ministry and co-chaired by the relevant WWF Country Office^[1].

The structures of the National Hubs (i.e., National Steering Committee and Technical Working Groups) as well as governing and operational processes will be developed and established at the onset of project execution (under Activity 2.1.1.4).

Planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Several initiatives of relevance for the CRR project were identified at global, regional, and national level. This section provides a summary overview of the types of initiatives identified. Information such as GEF Project ID or lead agency for all identified GEF and Non-GEF projects can be found Annex 3. The project will coordinate with and build on these initiatives to i) benefit from lessons learned; and ii) effectively leverage relevant activities to maximize efficiency and impact.

At the global and regional level, three large scale global programs were identified: i) The GEF-funded Blue Nature Alliance (BNA), a global partnership led by Conservation International focused on the establishment of new and existing ocean conservation areas. BNA works in similar geographies with the GEF CRR project, which would be able to complement BNA efforts by providing access to data through the monitoring platforms, strengthening capacities for use of data in decision making and identifying sustainable business opportunities; ii) The Partnership in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) is an intergovernmental organization that builds intergovernmental and intersectoral partnerships, building capacities for integrated coastal and ocean management. The GEF CRR project will seek to engage with the networks, such as learning centers, established by PEMSEA and ensure cross exchange of knowledge materials; and iii) Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) ? Pacific-European Union Marine Partnership Programme (PEUMP Project) is a multi-partner project that aims to improve the economic, social, and environmental benefits for 15 Pacific states included in the African Caribbean Pacific (ACP) group through stronger regional economic integration and the sustainable management of natural resources and the environment. The GEF CRR project will share information and knowledge with the PEUMP programme.

At national level, Fiji identified four GEF supported projects that are of relevance to this GEF CRR initiative. This includes the UNDP/GEF project (ID 5398) implemented by the Ministry of Environment, and focused on a ?Ridge to Reef? approach, two initiatives aimed at strengthening financial resilience and ecosystem resilience for coral reefs (including one on public-private partnerships for coral reef insurance led by ADB and a second developing and deploying financing products to improve community resilience led by WTW in collaboration with WWF Pacific. The fourth initiative is focused on strengthening community engagement through the integration of LMMAs into Fiji?s Marine Protected Area systems. Given the relevance of all these initiatives, Executing Agencies of these GEF projects will be invited to participate in the National Hubs.

Solomon Islands identified six initiatives of relevance, three of which are GEF supported initiative. The GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef (R2R) and is focused on pollution and raising institutional and civil society awareness and capacity for action. GEF - Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change (PEBACC) program, the GEF - Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) program and the Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) ? PEUMP Project (an ocean planning program). Outcomes and lessons emerging from the programs focused on adaptation will inform the planned National Action Plan for Resilient Reefs (in light of the priority that stakeholders participating in the PPG placed on the need to strengthen understanding of linkages between coral reefs and climate change adaptations) and the project will ensure that lessons and information is shared between the MSP and Component 1 activities, particularly with regards to the Climate Data Platform.

Six initiatives of relevance were identified in Indonesia, of which two are GEF-supported initiatives, both of which are focused on strengthening the sustainability of fisheries in the Country: i) The Coastal Fisheries Initiative (CFI) and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management in Eastern Indonesia. The other initiatives identified include the ATSEA-2 (regional collaboration and coordination in the Arafura and Timor Seas (ATS) region through implementation of the regional strategic action program (SAP); Birdshead seascape, a place-based initiative which has established a dedicated conservation fund, the Blue Abadi Fund, to disburse grants to communities and agencies; COREMAP CTI III which includes the conservation and management of coral reefs in MPAs; and ISLME which plays a catalytic role in addressing transboundary concerns by assisting Indonesia and Timor-Leste to restore and sustain coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biodiversity through the collaborative development and subsequent implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP). All initiatives have experiences and lessons of relevance to the GEF CRR project and will be invited to share these through the National Hub for consideration when developing the National Action Plan for Climate Refuge Reefs.

In the Philippines, projects of relevance included the Coastal and Marine Management Program (CMEMP), a national program of DENR focused on the effective management of the country's coastal and marine ecosystems thereby increasing their ability to provide ecological goods and services to improve the quality of life of the coastal population particularly by ensuring food security, climate change resilience and disaster risk reduction; two projects involving planning and monitoring of relevance to Components 1 and 2 of the GEF CRR ? the Environmentally Critical Areas Network (ECAN) being led by PCSD and the project, Connectivity of Large MPAs contributing to refuge reefs and food security: Effective management of Large Marine Protected Areas led by WWF; Fish Right which has carried out a series of studies and established the IUU database which will be important to make reference to in the development of the National Action Plan for Climate Refuge Reefs; two projects that involve the development of financing strategies ? the Financing infrastructures and Facilities that promote carbon sequestration and/or Ocean Acidification and the project, Increasing Coral Resilience by Strengthening Marine Key Biodiversity Areas being implemented by WWF Philippines and DENR-BMB; as well as the regional project, Implementing the Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand (SCS-SAP) which has similar objectives to that of the GEF CRR and will therefore be consulted to ensure synergies and avoid redundancy of outputs.

Madagascar identified six GEF supported initiatives of relevance to this project and with which the GEF CRR project will establish close communication to ensure that strategies are aligned and that they draw on the lessons and experiences emerging to date. These include: Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFISH2); Strengthening the Network of New Protected Areas; Expanding and consolidating Madagascar's MPA network; Strategic Action Programme for Policy Harmonization and Institutional Reform in the Western Indian Ocean Region (WIO LME SAPPHERE); Inclusive conservation of sea turtles and seagrass habitats in the north and north-west of Madagascar; and Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the protection of the Western Indian Ocean from land-based sources and activities (WIOSAP). In addition, the Integrated Management of the Marine and Coastal Resources of the Northern Mozambique Channel (NoCaMo) is also of relevance as one of its objectives include the protection of coral reefs through CBNRM approaches. NoCaMo will be invited to join the National Hub as implementing partners include CRR partners and there is significant room for synergies between the two initiatives.

Tanzania identified 6 projects that are relevant to the GEF CRR Project. One project is a GEF Funded project, The Inclusive Conservation Initiative led by CI and IUCN that will run until 2026.

[1] It is proposed that the Steering Committee will be co-chaired by WWF country office in Fiji

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

Fiji		
5-year & 20 Year National Development Plan	The 20-Year Development Plan provides the forward-looking vision for 'Transforming Fiji' towards an even more progressive, vibrant and inclusive society. It outlines a framework that encompasses strategic policy maneuvers, new approaches to development and the aspirations of all Fijians. The Fiji NDP highlights the underlying theme of inclusive socio-economic development, which ties into this project as communities will be provided with increased technical capacity to mobilize investment opportunities.	Ministry of Economy, Republic of Fiji / 2017
National Adaptation Plan A pathway towards climate resilience	The NAP provides a clear vision for adaptation and identifies priorities to be addressed in partnership with academic institutions, development partners, and private sector entities over the next five years, and beyond. It addresses vulnerabilities identified by the Climate Vulnerability Assessment and adopts the values and principles of the NAP Framework. The Fiji NAP aims to improve climate change information management and increase Fijian's ability to predict and respond to climate events. This project will help achieve these goals through creating knowledge management tools, technical assistance and better threat analysis.	Government of the Republic of Fiji/ 2018
Fiji NDC Implementation Roadmap 2017-2030	Fiji's current Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) is specific to the energy sector both in terms of a GHG (greenhouse gas) baseline, with 2013 as the reference year, and in terms of potential mitigation actions. The goal of the NDC Implementation Roadmap 2017-2030 is to provide a temporal pathway with concrete mitigation actions and financing needs to achieve the transformational change called for under the NDC. This project will build capacity within local communities to understand and adapt to climate threats.	Fiji's Ministry of Economy with the Global Green Growth Institute / 2018

Climate Vulnerability Assessment	<p>The Fiji Climate Vulnerability Assessment was implemented with the objective to carry out a climate vulnerability assessment for Fiji and develop recommendations to inform Fiji's investment planning process. The initiative helped inform the national development priorities, and its investment and development plan for the next 5, 10 and 20 years. The project might also strengthen Fiji's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). The Climate Vulnerability Assessment for Fiji highlights the likely increase in extreme weather events, which lead to a large loss in income and assets for vulnerable communities. This project will increase the ability to deal with extreme weather events and recover financially with the help of long-term sustainable financing.</p>	<p>Government of the Republic of Fiji, 2017. Support of World Bank Group and GFDRR.</p>
Fiji's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution for UNFCCC	<p>Fiji submitted their Intended nationally determined contributions (INDC) to the UNFCCC Secretariat on the 5th of November 2015. No further revisions were undertaken, and the same document was endorsed and submitted as the First nationally determined contributions on 22nd April 2016. Within the Adaptation goals in Fiji's NDCs are several key actions that this project will support such as increasing the understanding of impacts of climate change and helping to preserve livelihoods through understanding reef protection.</p>	<p>Government of the Republic of Fiji Islands, 2015.</p>
National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for Fiji 2020-2025	<p>The Fiji National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2020-2025(NBSAP) is a national policy document recognized under the Environment Act 2005. The NBSAP is also a requirement for all parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This policy document prioritizes conserving biodiversity which will be achieved through this project by increasing community capacity to analyze and plan for marine protection.</p>	<p>Government of Fiji, 2020</p>
Environment and Climate Adaptation Levy (ECAL)	<p>The Government of Fiji's source of tax revenue is dedicated to climate resilience, which is a consortium of taxes on prescribed services, items and income. The ECAL is mandated to fund work across Fiji to support economic, community, and infrastructure adaptation to the worsening impacts of climate change, as well as protect the natural environment and reduce Fiji's carbon footprint. This project will be supporting ECAL efforts by providing resources for communities to increase adaptation to climate risks.</p>	<p>Government of Fiji, 2019</p>

Climate Change Act 2021	<p>The primary purpose of the Climate Change Act is to implement Fiji's international commitments and obligations to reduce its carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. Hence, this support to national planning and legislation will be particularly valuable for Fiji to achieve its NDC targets, especially in the context of carbon markets. The Act declares a climate emergency, creates new government bodies tasked with meeting emission targets, creates new criminal offenses, and paves the way for regular review processes for existing policies and new policies to address climate related issues or to reduce/adapt to the impacts of climate change. These new climate change policies include an Oceans Policy for Fiji and a 10-year moratorium on seabed mining. By putting in place a framework to deal with climate change and its impacts in a coherent way the Act has wide-ranging implications. For instance, it lays the foundation for carbon pricing and trading mechanisms to be introduced in the future. The Climate Change Act requires the disclosure by companies and state-owned entities of their exposure to climate risks and the measures they are taking through investment decisions to reduce them. It consolidates previous policy announcements on plastics and marine protection</p>	Government of Fiji, 2021
Solomon Islands		
Solomon Islands National Development Strategy (2016-2035)	<p>National Development Strategy 2016-2035 (NDS) aims to achieve an improvement on social and economic livelihood of all Solomon Islanders.</p> <p>The NDS recognizes that Solomon Islands needs to respond effectively to climate change and the increasing frequency of storm surges and floods. It identifies the importance of effectively managing the environment and risks of natural disasters. The successful implementation of the NDS will lead to sustainable and inclusive economic growth, increased investment opportunities for all Solomon Islanders, alleviation of poverty and improved food security, sustainable environment and contributing to climate change mitigation.</p> <p>The NDS includes a standalone objective for Climate change with an emphasis on disaster risk management and mitigation.</p>	

<p>UNFCCC Solomon Islands National Climate Change Policy (2017-2020) (outdated):</p>	<p>This document sets the Solomon Islands' Climate Change Policy for the period 2012-2017. It aims to ensure that the people, environment, and economy are resilient and able to adapt to the predicted impacts of climate change. This policy recognized the IPCC report 2007 stating that coral reefs will be greatly impacted in small islands states such as Solomon Islands. The guiding principle to ensure adaptation measures are informed by the best international research and local traditional knowledge is well aligned to Component 1 of the GEF CRR project. Priorities in this policy include strengthening coordination of limited climate change work across the country. It outlines the existing institutions that require capacity building and strengthening, this includes the Climate Change Division within the Ministry of Environment. This aligns well with Component 2 of the GEF CRR project</p>	
<p>UNFCCC National Determined Contribution for Solomon Islands</p>	<p>The Solomon Islands National Determined Contribution for the UNFCCC mention that the country contains over 900 volcanic islands and coral atolls that provide shelter for 600,000 inhabitants. The reefs provide fisheries and marine resources which make up a significant portion of the country's economy. Extreme weather events linked to climate change have caused higher tides which are systemically eroding and degrading coral reefs.</p>	<p>Solomon Islands Government, 2015</p>

Solomon Islands
National Adaptation
Programs of Action
(NAPA) 2008

The NAPA provides an analysis of the vulnerable sectors and immediate adaptation needs for Solomon Islands. It highlights priority sectors for investment, including, agriculture and food security; water supply and sanitation; education, awareness, and information; human settlements; and human health. The NAPA, however, only mentions the marine sector in terms of the impacts of climate variability on inshore and tuna fisheries. The NAPA points out that climate impacts will continue to exacerbate the current challenges in the Solomon Islands and prioritizes building the strengths of existing institutions (e.g., Climate Change Division), highlighting the following:

- Out of date or non-functional legislation and policies related to most sectors means that there is already an unclear framework within which to operate. While this is a limitation it could also be an opportunity as climate change could be integrated into the reviewed versions.

- Lack of human capacity and in most cases financial capacity to undertake current work is already a major limitation to current work programs

- Lack of coordination within the sectors is a theme that is reflected in most sectors, in part due to weak government frameworks and capacity constraints.

- There is a lack of awareness on climate change in general, and its impacts on the specific sectors across all levels of the government and the public.

- Lack of specific information and data on current and future vulnerability and risks across the country and across the sectors is hindering meaningful action on climate change

Key priority actions relevant for the WWF CRR are: -

- Increase the adaptive capacity and resilience of key vulnerable sectors

- Promote climate change education and information dissemination

<p>UNCBD National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (NBSAP 20016-2020) (outdated):</p>	<p>This document sets the Solomon Islands' strategy and implementation actions for biodiversity conservation. It aims to ensure that the national biodiversity can cope with climate change effects. The NBSAP includes coral reef ecosystems as key contributors to Solomon Islands' biodiversity, stating that these coral reefs are one of the most marine biodiverse regions in the world (TNC REA 2004). However, it also recognized there may be a drastic decline in the extent and state of the reefs, but this is not known due to lack of regular assessments. This document recognized the impact of climate change on the coral reef systems however, there is no mention of managing climate refuge coral reefs as an adaptation measure.</p> <p>Main priorities of the policy that align with the GEF CRR project are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theme 3: Protected Area systems: Establish sustainable livelihood alternatives through research into sustainable livelihood options, market research, incentives such as micro-financing and deliver small business trainings - Theme 6: Financial resources: Establish sustainable financing mechanisms so that biodiversity is managed - Theme 7: Human Resources and Capacity Building: Empower stakeholders to effectively participate in biodiversity management 	
<p>Program of work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) for the Solomon Islands (within the NBSAP)</p>	<p>Program of work on Protected Areas uses Traditional and Cultural Management practices and Institutional and legislative framework to protect 40% terrestrial / inland waters and 60% marine area within the protected areas of Solomon Islands. 90% of the population of Solomon Islands inhabits coastal areas and heavily rely on fish for their main protein source. This plan focuses on Unsustainable Fishing Practices as well as Climate Change to protect reef systems.</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment, CC, Disaster Management & Meteorology, 2016</p>
<p>Indonesia</p>		
<p>National Mid-Term Development Plan 2020-2024</p>	<p>Coral reef conservation and restoration is prioritized under the National Development Agenda No. 6 Environmental Management, Increasing Disaster Resilience, and Climate Change. The development plan guides all actions on policy, program, and activities of the government. The proposed PIF activities align and support the implementation of the Mid Term Development Plan, in particular component 3 that will enable economic/livelihood activity based on coral reef health.</p>	<p>MMAF, 2020</p>

<p>SDG Goal 14 ? Life Below Water</p>	<p>Under the Goal 14, there are two closely related with coral reef i.e. protect and restore ecosystem and conserve coastal and marine areas. Under this goal, Indonesia prioritizes coral reef protection under MPAs and restoration through the coral garden approach</p>	
<p>First Nationally Determined Contribution Republic of Indonesia</p>	<p>The Nationally Determined Contributions will be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employing a landscape approach: Recognizing that climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts are inherently multi-sectoral in nature, Indonesia takes an integrated, landscape-scale approach covering terrestrial, coastal and marine ecosystems. - Highlighting existing best practices and scale up the diversity of traditional wisdom - Mainstreaming climate agenda into development planning - Promoting climate resilience in food, water, and energy. <p>The CRR project will also build upon traditional knowledge and wisdom, to further the landscape-scale plan for conservation.</p>	<p>UNFCCC, 2016</p>
<p>Indonesia's National Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation (RAN-API)</p>	<p>The National Action Plan identifies two key areas of climate change and their impacts on livelihoods; increases in sea level and changes in weather, climate, and rainfall. The plan will address these threats through budget policy reform, development of socio-economic policies, and social-culture transformation to address climate change among other interventions. The CRR project will support the NAP by engaging local communities in climate change knowledge sharing and practices to best adapt to the increasing pressures.</p>	<p>State Ministry of Environment, 2007</p>

Improvement of maritime and marine management	<p>Improvement of maritime and marine management carried out by making Fisheries Management Area (WPP) as spatial basis in the development and utilization of marine affairs and fisheries, which includes strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Improve the management quality of WPP and its institutional arrangements in accordance with sustainable principles, marine spatial planning and coastal zoning plans. 2) Manage marine ecosystem and sustainable use of marine services, and management of marine area. 3) Increase production, productivity, standardization, and quality of marine and fishery products including fish, seaweed and salt. 4) Improve business facilitation, financing, technology and markets; protection of small-scale marine and fisheries business and access to resource management. 5) Improve competence, human resource capacity, technological innovation, and research in maritime and marine, as well as strengthening the marine and fisheries database. 	Indonesia National Medium Term Development Plan, 2020-2024
The Philippines		
Philippines Intended Nationally Determined Contributions	Republic of The Philippines Communicated their Intended Nationally Determined Contributions to the UNFCCC in October 2015. As a country highly vulnerable to climate and disaster risks, mitigation measures as presented in the INDC will be pursued in line with sustainable development and a low-emission development that promotes inclusive growth. The CRR Project supports the contribution of the Philippines by increasing national capacity in handling climate threats and risks.	UNFCCC, 2015
Updated Philippine Development Plan 2017-2022	The activities of the project will support the priority thrusts identified under the Updated PDP, especially on modernizing the habitat monitoring and impact evaluation of management interventions, and increasing resilience of communities through provision of sustainable livelihood and economic opportunities, among others.	National Economic and Development Authority, 2017
National Integrated Protected Area System or NIPAS Act	The National Integrated Protected Area System includes "outstandingly remarkable areas and biologically important public lands that are habitats of rare and endangered species of plants and animals, biographic zones and related ecosystems, whether terrestrial, wetland, or marine". All such areas shall be designed as "protected areas?".	Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, 1992

<p>The Strategic Environmental Plan (SEP) for Palawan Act or Republic Act No. (RA) 7611 of 1992:</p>	<p>The Strategic Environmental Plan (SEP) for Palawan Act or Republic Act No. (RA) 7611 of 1992 provides for the adoption of a comprehensive framework for the sustainable development of Palawan, compatible with protecting and enhancing the natural resources and endangered environment of the province. The national vision and action plan for climate refuge reefs developed under Component 2 of the GEF CRR project will need to refer to the SEP.</p>	
<p>Madagascar</p>		
<p>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development Strategic Priorities</p>	<p>The 6 strategic priorities of the Madagascar Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reforestation, biodiversity conservation, and ecosystem restoration 2. Sustainable and improved renewable natural resources governance, notably for the benefit of local communities 3. Green and blue economies, sustainable development with consideration for waste management 4. Information, Education and Communications: integration of Environment in school curriculum 5. Environmental diplomacy 6. Climate change and renewable energy <p>This CRR GEF project will support the ministry's priorities by providing educational tools and resources to further understand marine planning and management.</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, 2020</p>
<p>Sydney Promise Commitment Implementation Process (<i>in progress</i>)</p>	<p>At the World Parks Congress held in Sydney in 2014, Madagascar pledged to triple the number of its marine protected areas</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, 2014</p>
<p>The General policy of the Government of Madagascar (Politique G?n?rale de l'Etat ? - PGE)</p>	<p>The primary objective of the PGE is to build a strong nation, prosperous, and cohesive, for the pride and well-being of all Malagasy. The pillars are: Peace and security, Energy and water for everyone., Fight against corruption: with zero tolerance, all responsible/officials need to become a model of integrity and uprightness, Education for all, Health: is an inalienable right for all citizens, Decent employment for all, Industrialization, Tourism industry, Food self-sufficiency, Sustainable management and conservation of natural resources, Promotion of housing and upgrading, Autonomy and empowerment of local and regional governments, Sport, Culture: construction of museums and rehabilitation of cultural and historical heritages. The CRR GEF project will support the delivery of Madagascar's PGE by strengthening national capacity and sharing knowledge across all relevant stakeholders on reef conservation and better management of marine natural resources.</p>	<p>The Government of Madagascar, 2019</p>

<p>National Policy to Combat Climate Change Being updated</p>	<p>The national policy aims to strengthen the fight against climate change in the country, and in this sense, serves as a reference for actions to be undertaken. It also gives the main orientations of the fight against climate change focused on implementation strategies. It thus makes it possible to encourage investors and technical and financial partners in the field of climate change.</p> <p>The implementation of Madagascar's climate change policy requires measures, based on five axes: adaptation, mitigation, mainstreaming of climate change at all levels and in all sectors, development of instruments of sustainable financing, and the promotion of research, development and transfer of technologies and adaptive management.</p> <p>The CRR GEF project will contribute to the implementation of Madagascar's national CC policy by strengthening national capacities and sharing knowledge among all relevant stakeholders on the consideration of climate change in reef conservation and better management. marine natural resources.</p>	
<p>National Biodiversity and Action Plans 2015-2025</p>	<p>NBSAP that calls for more extensive and effective protection of Madagascar's marine and coastal biodiversity. This will be accomplished by developing and implementing strategies to minimize the various pressures (anthropogenic or climate) on marine and coastal ecosystems, including coastal forests and their associated neighboring habitats. The plan also involves strengthening and encouraging the use of local techniques, which this CRR project would promote through consultations with stakeholders, particularly on traditional cultural knowledge.</p>	<p>Convention on Biological Diversity, 2016</p>
<p>Madagascar's Nationally Determined Contributions Being updated</p>	<p>Madagascar is among the top-ten countries in terms of coastal zones' extent. It also hosts a significant part of the Northern Mozambique Channel transnational area which represents the world's 2nd marine biodiversity hotspot (after the Coral Triangle area). The island frequently experiences extreme weather events that importantly affect its national economy and population's livelihood. In terms of NDCs, the Republic of Madagascar is then equally committed to contribute to mitigate climate change, as well as to reduce climate change vulnerability and promote adaptation measures. The CRR Project will support Madagascar in that regards by strengthening national institutions' capacity on coral reefs and associated marine ecosystems, which will be key in contributing to key priority actions defined in its NDCs (references to the reinforcement of natural protection and reduction of the vulnerability of coastal, inshore and marine areas affected by coastal erosion and receding shorelines progress, and to the formulation and implementation of the national policy of the maritime territory of Malagasy, considering climate change).</p>	<p>The Republic of Madagascar/MEDD 2015</p>

Climate Change Environment Research Master Plan 2015-2019	While the plan is outdated, it is an important point of reference for the development of the national action plan for climate refuge reefs. In particular, the emphasis on multi-disciplinary research as well as indigenous adaption and mitigation practices.	Ministry of Higher Education (Universities) and Research, 2015
Ministerial Decree n°21816-2014 regarding harvest ban on black corals (Antipatharia sp.) at national level	Through its Ministry of Fisheries, Madagascar has strictly forbidden any form of harvesting and use of black corals, notably its extraction, collection, storing, transportation, purchase and selling, on its entire territory. The CRR project will generally contribute to raise the importance of corals in the country, and thereby contributes to its conservation and sustainable use of coral areas.	Ministry of Fisheries, 2014
Tanzania		
United Republic of Tanzania National Adaptation Programme of Action	The main objectives of Tanzania's NAPA that are directly supported by the CRR project are: ? Protect life and livelihoods of the people, infrastructure, biodiversity and environment; ? Increase public awareness to climate change impacts and adaptation activities in communities, civil society and government officials; supported through toolkits provided by this project ? To assist communities to improve and sustain human and technological capacity for environmentally friendly exploitation of natural resources in a more sustainable way in a changing climate; ? To complement national and community development activities which are hampered by adverse effects of climate change;	UNFCCC, 2007
Tanzania's Intended Nationally Determined Contributions	The NDCs for Tanzania will be implemented by 2030. The Reef, Coastal and Marine contributions were listed as: Strengthening management of coastal resources and beach erosion/sea level rise control systems. b) Promoting livelihood diversification for coastal communities. c) Improving monitoring and early warning systems of both sea level rise impacts and extreme weather events for building adaptive capacity. d) Enhancing program for management of saltwater inundation and intrusion. e) Mangrove & shoreline restoration program. f) Enhancing conservation & fishery resource management. g) Strengthening key fisheries management services for sound development and management of the fishery sector for resilience creation. The CRR project will help achieve these contributions by providing marine management guidance and increasing community involvement.	UNFCCC, 2015

Tanzania National Climate Change Strategy	The National Climate Change Strategy, developed the support the Tanzania Development Vision 2025, focuses on cross-cutting issues, including the establishment and implementation of awareness creation programs, establishment of adequate research capacity, building sufficient capacities of social facilities to address climate change related health risks and promoting effective documentation of indigenous knowledge on climate change adaptation and mitigation in diverse sectors. The CRR project will highlight indigenous knowledge and cultural understanding of climate change threats, in alignment with the National Climate Change Strategy.	United Republic of Tanzania VP Office, 2012
Tanzania National Environment Management Act	The National Environment Management Act is an Act to provide for a legal and institutional framework for sustainable management of the environment; to outline principles for management, impact and risk assessments, public participation, compliance and enforcement; to provide basis for implementation of international instruments on environment; to provide for implementation of the National Environment Policy. Some aspects of this act, for example, the Promotion of coastal environmental zones, will be supported by the CRR project through the provision of management plans and resources to better protect the habitats.	National Environment Management Council, 2004
National Trade Policy (2003)	The goal of Tanzania's National Trade Policy is to facilitate smooth integration into the Multilateral Trading System (MTS) and roll back the gradual descent towards marginalization. It is intended to ensure that liberalization offers meaningful, identifiable, and measurable benefits. Relating to the project, the National Trade policy has a component of building capacities and skills that depends on human skills development and institutional capacity building, transformation of production systems and overall private sector development.	

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

Component 1 of the project is centered around promoting sharing, accessing and using knowledge to inform action. This includes the connection of stakeholders to a global network and best practices through learning events, communities of practice, the establishment of a monitoring system comprising of a climate data platform. The learning events will be designed to create space and opportunity for exchanging information, experiences and strategies as well as providing access to practical resources, tools, and training. They will be essential for assisting coastal communities in understanding the impacts of global change on critical resources and the changes to follow. This will involve encouraging and supporting individuals participating in the learning events to continue to interact with one another around shared interests and concerns through communities of practice using online platforms. The project will also train

and strengthen capacities within project countries on how to use, interpret and adapt near-real time monitoring data for early warning systems and decision-making frameworks.

The learning events (Outcome 1.1) and monitoring system (Outcome 1.2) under Component 1 will utilize the CRRRI Knowledge Hub (described in more detail in the baseline tables provided in Annex 2 in the full document). The CRRRI Knowledge Hub is an online platform that has been conceptualized to provide a space for knowledge exchange amongst stakeholders across the world involved in the conservation and management of climate refuge reefs. The Hub exists in its first prototype iteration and is being developed to comprise four focus areas: Supporting (1) research, (2) conservation and community development action, (3) teaching and learning, and (4) monitoring and evaluation. It is being developed to be accessible to users with a diverse range of backgrounds, expertise, and connectivity, as well as in languages and cultures relevant to the CRRRI countries.

Component 4 of the project utilizes knowledge to build high level and widespread support for climate refuge reefs as well as supports local communities in documenting and sharing their wealth of traditional and indigenous knowledge within their countries and beyond. Focusing on the climate refuge reefs in priority areas, the project will support local communities to share their histories, customs and cultures through their own voices, ways of knowing and valuing.

Narratives, lessons and experiences generated will be shared through the knowledge platform and capacity strengthening activities under Component 1, through meetings of the National Hub (Component 2), with investors and government officials in the awareness raising activities under Component 3 as well as regionally and globally through the IW:LEARN meetings, GEF International Waters Conference and other relevant events and platforms.

The project will be allocating at least 1% of the GEF grant to participate actively in IW:LEARN activities, primarily under Output 4.1.3, which will include:

- ? Participation in at least two IW:LEARN regional meetings, one GEF International Waters Conferences and other masterclasses and knowledge exchange events.
- ? Support Government and Non-Governmental members of the National Hubs to attend and actively participate in IW:LEARN regional meetings
- ? Utilize the knowledge generated through the project (including studies, awareness and communication materials and first hand narratives) to develop at least 2 experience notes and a results note to be shared during the IW:LEARN regional meetings and GEF International Waters Conferences
- ? Develop a webpage to be integrated into the CRRRI website to enable widespread dissemination of projects results and lessons learnt.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

This project utilizes and adaptive management approach, supported by monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation tools and processes will be developed at the global level to ensure consistency in data gathering and analysis. Sense making and use of the outcomes of monitoring and evaluation for learning, communication, accountability, and adaptive management will take place at the national level through the National Hubs to ensure that all key stakeholders are involved.

The projects monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes will support learning, communication, accountability, and adaptive management with the members of the National Hubs actively involved in contributing to and using the outcomes of M&E for learning and planning purposes.

Ultimate responsibility for M&E resides with the PMU and M&E Specialist, who will coordinate with the National Technical Facilitator in each country. The National Technical Facilitator will be responsible for ensuring that data is collected in a timely manner, recording achievements against targets in the Results Framework (provided as Annex 9 in the full project document) and preparing the six monthly and annual progress reports and annual workplans. These will be consolidated by the M&E Specialist for onward submission to the Global Steering Committee.

A mid and an end of term evaluation are scheduled for the project, which fall under the responsibility of the PMU. The evaluations will utilize a learning-oriented and utilization focused approach, engaging members of the National Hub during both data collection and sense-making stages.

Annual reflection workshops will be held at both national and global levels and are aimed at providing stakeholders the opportunity to reflect on progress to date, make recommendations for drafting annual workplans and share experiences and lessons. At the national level, annual reflection workshops will take place through the National Hubs while at the global level, members of the Steering Committee will come together across the 6 countries.

The M&E component has been budgeted with **USD 525,870** for five years (Table 1), which includes staff time, office running costs, and project planning, review, monitoring & evaluations. The total budgeted cost for Monitoring & Evaluation component is **7.66%** of the total project cost.

Detailed Budget for Monitoring and Evaluation

GEF CRR Project

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Outcome 4.2. Informed and adaptive project management.		
		Output 4.2.1 M&E reports, including project progress reports, midterm evaluation and terminal evaluation	Output 4.2.2 (4) Annual reflection workshops with project executing partners and main stakeholders	TOTAL OUTCOME 4.2
Grants/ Sub-grants				-
	Sub-grant to NTF Fiji	26,247	23,700	49,947
	Sub-grant to NTF Solomon Islands	10,753	15,000	25,753
	Sub-grant to NTF Indonesia	17,500	18,753	36,253
	Sub-grant to NTF Philippines	44,460	27,622	72,082
	Sub-grant to NTF Madagascar	13,600	20,917	34,517
	Sub-grant to NTF Tanzania	45,318	32,000	77,318
Total Sub-grants		157,878	137,992	295,870
	Mid Term and Final Evaluation Consultancies	75,000		75,000
Total International Consultants		75,000	-	75,000
	M&E Specialist	60,000	15,000	75,000
Total Staff Costs		60,000	15,000	75,000
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Global Annual Reflection Workshops		80,000	80,000
Grand Total		292,878	232,992	525,870

The total amount budgeted for Monitoring and Evaluation is 525,870 USD which will cover activities in the 6 countries. The subgrants to the National Technical Facilitators include M&E functions detailed in Annex 5, the NTF TORs. Some of these responsibilities under the subgrants include:

Review progress of work plan and monitoring plan.

Assists independent mid-term and final evaluations by providing all requested financial and technical information.

Works with the project M&E officer to develop the project M&E framework ensuring that all project partners have a shared understanding of the M&E requirements.

Participation in (4) Annual reflection workshops with project partners and main stakeholders.

Ensure that annual reflection meetings and other fora convened by the Hub are well organized and facilitated to meet their objectives.

The table below is a Summary of reporting requirements for the project **budgeted under M&E**

M&E/ Reporting Document	How the document will be used	Timeframe	Responsible for generating report	Recipient of the report
Inception Report	Summarize decisions made during inception workshop, including changes to project design, budget, Results Framework, etc.	Within three months of inception workshop	PMU	Global Steering Committee >> WWF GEF Agency
Quarterly technical reports	Inform PMU PM on progress, challenges and needs of activities in the field	Every 3 months	NTF	PMU
Quarterly financial reports	Assess financial progress and management	Every 3 months	NTF	PMU
Quarterly financial reports	Assess financial progress and management	Every 3 months	PMU	WWF GEF Agency

<p>WWF Project Progress Report (PPR) with RF and workplan tracking (for the 12month reports).</p>	<p>Inform management decisions and drafting of annual workplan and budget. Share lessons internally and externally. Report to the PSC and GEF Agency on the project progress.</p>	<p>Every six months</p>	<p>PMU Project Manager and M&E Officer</p>	<p>Global Steering Committee >> WWF GEF Agency</p>
<p>Mid-term Project Evaluation Report</p>	<p>External formative evaluation of the project. Recommendations for adaptive management for the second half of the project period. Inform PSC, GEF and other stakeholders of project performance to date.</p>	<p>Midterm</p>	<p>External expert or organization to be contracted and managed by WWF-US evaluation unit</p>	<p>Global Steering Committee >> WWF GEF Agency</p>
<p>Terminal Project Evaluation Report</p>	<p>External summative evaluation of the overall project. Recommendations for GEF and those designing related projects.</p>	<p>Before project completion</p>	<p>External expert or organization to be contracted and managed by PMU</p>	<p>Global Steering Committee >> WWF GEF Agency</p>
<p>Project Closeout Report</p>	<p>Based on the format of the PPR Summarize project results and overall outcomes to the PSC and GEF Agency.</p>	<p>One month after technical close</p>	<p>PMU</p>	<p>Global Steering Committee >> WWF GEF Agency</p>

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF)?

As mentioned earlier, the design of the project is based on the premise that successful use, management, and conservation of coastal and marine resources requires that both women and men have equal access to opportunities and the ability to participate in, and benefit from, the project initiatives.

The project seeks to strengthen social equity in the conservation and management of climate refuge coral reefs ? ensuring that women and men from local communities have a strong voice in the planning and decision-making processes that will take place through the Hub (under Component 2). This includes activities dedicated to supporting local communities to define and articulate their aspirations and priorities and ensure that these are integrated into the national vision and action plan for climate refuge reefs (developed under Outcome 2.2). This will involve strengthening skills, knowledge, and motivation of both local communities as well as other stakeholders involved in the Hub to ensure inclusive and equitable involvement of local communities (Output 2.1.2). Under Outcome 4.1.1, local communities will be supported to share their realities and narratives around climate refuge reefs nationally as well as globally, ensuring that they have a strong voice in the communications and awareness raising activities.

Component 3 is primarily focused around identifying investment opportunities for reef-friendly businesses with a particular focus on SMEs that will generate new sustainable livelihood opportunities for local communities (with a particular focus on women). Under Component 3, the project will analyze needs and opportunities for SMEs to manage risks and needs to maximize their potential to strengthen livelihood security in a manner that is inclusive and equitable (with a particular focus on women and vulnerable groups). This may include strengthening women-led enterprises and economic empowerment through enabling access to financial services and strengthening financial literacy.

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification *

	CEO Endorsement/Approva I		
PIF		MTR	TE
Low	Low		

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

In compliance with WWF Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (ESSF), as detailed in WWF's Environmental and Social Safeguard Integrated Policies and Procedures (SIPP), the GEF CRR Project was screened according to the Standard on Environmental and Social Risk Management. The Project was categorized as a Low Risk/Category "C" project, given that it is a global technical assistance project, working on policy and processes in seven countries and with no on the ground impacts.

A gender analysis and action plan has been prepared (Appendix 1) as well as the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, including the Grievance Redress Mechanism in (Appendix 6).

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
ESS Screen - GEF CRR1	CEO Endorsement ESS	
Signed_Categorization_Memo___Coral_Reef_Rescue	CEO Endorsement ESS	
CRR1 - ESSF PIF pre-screen	Project PIF ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please also see Appendix 8 for the Project Results Framework:

APPENDIX 8 RESULTS FRAMEWORK - SUMMARY

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>Project Objective: To strengthen capacity and solutions that ensure the long-term survival of climate refuge coral reef ecosystems, thereby conserving their biodiversity and supporting the blue economies and communities dependent on them.</p>								
<p>[GEF Core Indicator 4.1] Area (# ha) of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, non-certified)</p>								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p><u>Definition:</u> This indicator captures the landscape area being managed to benefit biodiversity, but which is not certified Landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity: The area includes the total terrestrial HA demarcated for improved landuse practices (e.g. improving sustainable agricultural practices; restoration of forest areas etc) in the National Action Plans for Climate Refuge Reefs</p> <p>Approved National Action Plans for Climate Refuge Reefs include concrete commitments to improve landuse practices in a manner that will significantly mitigate threats to climate</p>	<p><u>Responsibility:</u> PMU M&E Officer and NTFs <u>Method/Source -</u> Document Review (review of National action plans for climate resilient reefs); Interviews members of the National Hubs? *threats analysis to inform adjustments to the target HA <u>Disaggregated by:</u> Country</p>	TBD as part of the development of the National Action Plans for Climate Refuge Reefs (based on the threats analysis)	-	-	-	4000	<p>Levels of awareness amongst government and non-governmental stakeholders on the value and importance of climate refuge reefs</p> <p>Only the total ha target will contribute to percent achievement of this indicator (not the disaggregation).</p>	Assumes willingness of stakeholders to negotiate and reach a consensus around commitments

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
[GEF Core Indicator 7.4] Level of engagement in IW: Learn through participation and delivery of key products								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p><u>Definition:</u> This indicator is based on a rating for the level of engagement in International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN)</p> <p><u>Rating scale:</u> 1= No Participation 2= Website in line with IW:LEARN guidance active 3 = As above, plus strong participation in training/twinning events and production of at least one experience note and one results note 4 = As above, plus active participation of project staff and country representatives at International Waters conferences and the provision of spatial data and other data points via project website</p>	<p><u>Responsibility:</u> NTFs and the PMU <u>Method/Source ?</u> Progress reports <u>Disaggregated by:</u> N/A</p>	N/A	-	2	4	4	Partial contribution of indicator achievement will be based on the rating scale and in agreement with WWF GEF (e.g. If target is 4, but only 3 was achieved, it would be 75%)	Assumes that IW:Learn platforms and fora will be organized in a timely manner to enable engagement of countries

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
[GEF Core Indicator 11] Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>Definition: This indicator captures the total number of direct beneficiaries including the proportion of women beneficiaries. Direct beneficiaries include the number of individual people who receive targeted support from the project and/or who use the specific resources that the project maintains or enhances. Targeted support is the intentional and direct assistance of a project to individuals or groups of individuals who are aware that they are receiving that support and/or who use the specific resource</p> <p>Cumulative</p> <p>-</p> <p><i>Note ? target numbers are aggregated from the Component targets below</i></p>	<p>Responsibility: NTFs & PMU Method/Source ? Tally from workplans Disaggregated by: Gender - -</p>	None	-	6,950 50% are women		9,850 50% are women	<p>Y2 information al targets are: <u>Learning events:</u> 1500 individuals, of which at least 50% are women. <u>Climate Data Platform:</u> 200 individuals <u>Community visioning and community narratives:</u> 5000 individuals, of which at least 50% are women <u>National Hub activities:</u> 250 individuals directly engaging and benefitting from the Hub activities</p> <p>Y4 information al targets are: <u>Learning events:</u> 3000 individuals, of which at least 50% are women. <u>Climate Data Platform:</u> 600 individuals <u>Community</u></p>	Assumes that individuals in countries and globally will actively engage in the opportunities offered by the project and COVID-19 restrictions will not limit engagement of stakeholders, particularly at site level

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
COMPONENT 1: Global to local capacity strengthening for climate refuge coral reef monitoring and conservation								
Outcome 1.1 Government and non-government practitioners, academia and local communities are connected into networks of knowledge and best practices to identify solutions for the conservation of climate refuge coral reefs and connected ecosystems.								
Indicator 1.1a: Number of trainees involved in online learning opportunities (which incorporate a gender-inclusive approach and language) of which at least 30% have decision making and leadership responsibilities that have influence on climate refuge coral reefs and at least are 30% women								
<p>Trainees [with] decision-making and leadership responsibilities that have influence: trainees assumed to have these responsibilities and influence with at least 30% members of the National Hubs and 30% are women.</p> <p><u>Cumulative</u></p>	<p>Responsibility: UQ Method/Source: Project reports - training records</p> <p>Disaggregated by: a) Gender b) Country c) Stakeholder type (National/Local Government; Private Sector; Community; Academia; Non-Governmental Organization)</p>	None	-	500 Total individuals 30% national hub members 30% women	1500 Total individuals 30% national hub members 30% women	3000 individuals 30% national hub members 30% women	The percent achievement of this indicator will be based 1/3 on the total target, 1/3 on the Hub member target, and 1/3 on the gender target.	Assumes active engagement of national hub members and other stakeholders in learning opportunities and that the decisions, actions, and behaviors of members of the national hubs are likely to have impact and influence on climate refuge coral reefs
Indicator 1.1b: Percent of participants who view the added value of networking and relationships building opportunities offered through the learning and knowledge sharing events as high/very high								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>This indicator gathers participants views on the added value of the project learning and knowledge sharing events for networking and relationship building, in order to better realise their objectives for the conservation and management of climate refuge reefs</p> <p>Participants : <u>Non-Cumulative</u></p>	<p>Responsibility: UQ Method/Source: Post-training gender-sensitive survey Disaggregated by: a) Gender b) Country</p>	None	-	40%	55%	75%	Disaggregation is informational only and does not influence percent achievement towards DO rating.	Assumes active engagement stakeholders in learning opportunities (online training and communities of practice)
<p>Outcome 1.2: Near-real-time monitoring data and information is obtained at global to national scales to inform action by national and regional hubs</p>								
<p>Indicator 1.2a: Number of registered users and their visitations on Climate Data Platform.</p>								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>This indicator captures the level of success in increasing accessibility and access to near-real time climate data through the Climate Data Platform.</p> <p>Registered users: individuals who may represent policy makers, practitioners and local communities involved in conservation and management of climate refuge reefs who have fully registered with the Climate Data Platform.</p> <p>Visitations: Traffic record on unique visits to the platform</p> <p><u>Non-Cumulative</u></p>	<p>Responsibility: UQ Method/Source: User traffic records. Refer to Gender Action Plan activity 1.2.1.1 Disaggregated by gender if possible</p>	None	-	-	? 200 users ? 400 visitations	? 300 users ? 600 visitations	The percent achievement of this indicator will be based 50% on the users and 50% on the visitations.	Assumes willingness and ability of stakeholders to access and utilize the Climate Data Platform (e.g. basic infrastructure such as computers and internet connections in place to enable access)
COMPONENT 2: Planning for climate refuge coral reef rescues at the national level								
Outcome 2.1 Increased coordination and collaboration amongst stakeholders across sectors for the inclusive conservation and management of climate refuge reefs over the long term								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
Indicator 2.1a: Percent of identified stakeholders engaged with the National Hub								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>Indicator measures the project's level of success in mobilizing a diverse range of stakeholders that influence climate refuge reefs (including local communities, private sector, government and non-governmental entities from environment, development and the finance and business sectors).</p> <p>Engaged: Y2: identified stakeholders as having medium-high impact/influence on climate refuge reefs accept nomination</p> <p>Y3-4: Nominated representatives participates in at least 70% of the Hubs meetings</p> <p>Cumulative</p>	<p>Responsibility: NTF/PMU</p> <p>Method/Source: Project reports; Survey and follow up interviews carried out by the PMU with members of the national hubs</p> <p>Disaggregated by: a) Gender b) Country c) Stakeholder type (National/Local Government ; Private Sector; Community; Academia; Non-Governmental Organization)</p>	None		60%	? 60% ? 40% ? 15% women youth	? 60% ? 40% ? 15% women youth	To determine percent achievement of this indicator for the DO rating, an average will be taken across all countries. In years 3 and 4, each country achievement against the indicator will first be determined by averaging achievement against all three annual targets, such that the three targets each contribute 1/3. Then an average of each country's achievement will determine percent achievement of this indicator.	Assumes willingness and support of all stakeholders for the National Hub

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
Indicator 2.1b: Extent to which Community Vision is integrated into National Action Plans of National Hubs								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>Extent to which Community Vision is integrated: In Y3, Each Draft National Action Plan will be assessed for how well the National Community Vision is integrated according to the scale below. This will be averaged across six countries to determine if the target is met.</p> <p>For Y4, Each National Action Plan will be assessed for how well the National Community Vision is integrated according to the scale below. This will be averaged across six countries to determine if the target is met.</p> <p>0: does not integrate any aspects of Community Vision 25: integrates less than half of aspects in Community Vision</p>	<p>Responsibility: NTF/PMU Method/Source: Score for each National Action Plan according to Scorecard at left Then averaged. Will review: Review of Community Visions and draft/final National Action Plans. Please see 2.1.3. in GAP. Disaggregated by: Country</p>	None		--	75%	75%	Partial achievement for each country will be determined by the rating scale and agreed with WWF GEF. For example, if the target is 75% and 25% is achieved, that would be 33% achievement). Then an average across all the countries will be taken to determine the percent achievement of this indicator for the DO rating.	Assumes willingness of local communities as well as all stakeholders to support the meaningful engagement of local communities

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			Y R1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
Outcome 2.2 A shared vision and agenda for climate refuge reefs developed through evidence informed and inclusive planning processes								
Indicator 2.2a Percent of National Hub members committed to the realization of the vision and synergistic solutions identified in National Vision and Action Plan for climate refuge reefs in the short, medium and long term								
The indicator measures the commitment of national stakeholders to the realization of the national vision and action plan for climate refuge reefs in the short, medium, and long term Committed: Y2 % countries where Threats/ Opportunity analysis is done Y3 % countries where Cost/benefit analysis done Y4 % countries that endorse Action Plan - <u>Non-Cumulative</u>	Responsibility: NTF/PMU Method/Source: Project reports; and Review of Hub reports and interviews with Hub members by PMU Disaggregated by: Country	None	-	80%	80%	40%	Percent achievement of this indicator for the DO rating will be averaged across all countries. Partial achievement determined for each country will be agreed with WWF.	Assumes the support of governments and other stakeholders and willingness to actively engage in the planning process
COMPONENT 3: Financial solutions for climate refuge coral reef rescue								
Outcome 3.1 Investment opportunities identified to promote increased sustainable financial flows to relevant seascapes and landscapes to reduce threats to climate refuge coral reefs								
Indicator 3.1a: Level of advancement of pipeline of projects established by the National Hub Steering Committee.								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
<p>This indicator measures progress towards the establishment of a pipeline of reef-friendly businesses to be supported and scaled up through private and blended finance. Reef friendly businesses will be defined through a set of common criteria, informed by scoping exercises in each country as well as the Community Vision and the National Hub Action Plans. This will include businesses that can demonstrate additional positive contribution to reef conservation, livelihoods enhancement and strong community benefits</p> <p>Level of advancement measured by scorecard (see below) based on: Y1 technical assistance Y2 S...</p>	<p>Responsibility: NTF; PMU; Method/Source: Project Reports and document reviews Disaggregated by: Types of reef-friendly businesses to be disaggregated by: a) Gender (Women-owned/Men-owned businesses) b) Sector c) Country -</p>	Existing levels of reef-friendly businesses and enterprises would need to be established during execution	3	3 30% women owned	3	4 30% women owned	Partial achievement will be determined based on the rating scale and in agreement with WWF. For purposes of the DO rating, percent achievement in years 2 and 4 will be equally weighted across both targets (level of advancement and percent women owned). Then the level of achievement will be averaged across all countries to determine the DO rating.	Y4: Assumes willingness of businesses and an enabling environment to support and incentivize reef-friendly businesses

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
COMPONENT 4: Knowledge Management & Monitoring and Evaluation								
Outcome 4.1 Increased awareness of governments, donors and climate refuge local communities, and knowledge (from local to global level) on the value of climate refuge coral reefs, their main threats, and good practices/actions for their conservation.								
Indicator 4.1a: Percent of National Hub members aware of the value and importance of climate refuge reefs								
<p>Indicator measures the effectiveness of the campaigns and awareness raising activities in raising support for climate refuge coral reefs</p> <p>Aware: National Hub member self-reports in survey as supportive or very supportive. Of the need to put in place measures to ensure the survival of climate refuge reefs.</p> <p><u>Non-Cumulative</u></p>	<p>Responsibility: NTF & PMU Method/Source: Baseline to be established through a survey administered to members of the National Hub; PMU to conduct interviews with members of the Hub as well as site level visits where possible Disaggregated by: Country</p>	To be established as soon as the National Hubs are in place	-	60%	60%	60%	-	<p>There are no country targets to contribute to DO rating as disaggregation is informational only.</p> <p>Assumes that competing priorities will not overshadow the significance of climate refuge reefs</p>
Outcome 4.2 Informed and adaptive project management								
Indicator 4.2: Percent of monitoring plan effectively implemented and utilized for supporting communication, accountability, and adaptive management								

Project Components & Outcomes; Indicators & Definition	Responsibility; Method & Disaggregation/ Source	Baseline	Targets				Notes	Assumptions
			YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4		
Indicator measures the effectiveness and utility of the monitoring processes with effectiveness and utility Effectively implemented and utilized: Y1 2 PPRs, 4 QFRs, 1 RE Y2 2 PPRs, 4 QFRs, 1 RE, 1 MTE Y3 Y13 2 PPRs, 4 QFRs, 1 RE Y4 ? 2 PPRs, 1 PCR, 4 QFR, 1 RE, 1 TE <u>Non-Cumulative</u>	Responsibility: PMU Method/Source: Progress reports Disaggregated by: N/A -	None	100	100	100	100		Assumes willingness of stakeholders to share required information in a timely manner

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Official GEF Review During PIF Stage

GEF Sec Comment	Agency Response
Part I. Project Information	
Focal area elements	
Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?	

10/01/2020

Partly. The GEF 7 IW focal area strategy clearly spells out the core transboundary mandate. In the case of this proposed investment it has been shared verbally multiple times that that the rationale for this investment is directly tied to the multiple Large marine SAPs that has been endorsed at ministerial level. Therefore, please ensure that these SAPs are identified and that the proposed investment align with the priorities in these SAPs. This needs to be part of the scoping of the proposal.

Further, two LOEs are still missing, please provide these.

10/10/2020

Agreed. We have included references to the 6 LMEs in which the resilient reefs are located. We have also included information of an analysis of the endorsed LMEs SAPs priorities related to Coral Reef protection. All SAPs place special emphasis on coral reef protection. We have included information on how the proposed project would help implementation of the SAPs.

The two missing LOEs (Indonesia and Philippines) have been uploaded in the portal.

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?

10/01/2020

No, please address following points:

1) Results framework mentions investments in seven countries, while project is only endorsed in 6 countries. please ensure consistency and that all countries are aware of these activities are being planned.

2) The outputs included in the RF are primarily qualitative, please revise to become more quantitative.

3) Please include more descriptive text that can explain what each component will be delivering. Currently it is only possible to get a very narrow understanding of component activities as described in the initial paragraph in section C of the submission.

4) In connection with point 3, it is eg not possible to understand what "National and regional coral reef hubs" entail

5) output 2.2.3 includes identifying reef areas. It was understood that the baseline material had already identified such areas. Please explain.

6) The Results Framework includes development of a number of decision support tools. It is noted that GEF has previously invested successfully in Capturing Coral Reef Ecosystems Services, CCRES. This investment developed a number of such tools. Utilization of these tools need to feature much more central.

7) The project proposes to be allocating half of the GEF grant to global activities and scoping for potential economic plans. This is too high a portion of the budget, considering that component 2, that will be working in 6 countries only have been allocated a mere 30% of the funding. Please revise.

8) Please revise IWLEARN indicator descriptive language. The project will be running over a period of 48 months, hence it will be possible to participate in 2 IWCs.

9) Further, please revise language to be including something along the following lines: The project will be allocating atleast 1% of the GEF grant to participate actively in the IWLEARN activities, such as IWCs, regional and topical relevant meetings during project implementation, produce atleast 2 experience notes, a results note and host a website to ensure dissemination of projects results and lessons learned.

10/10/2020

Corrected. Results framework (Table B) mentions investments in 6 countries. Activities in Cuba (the 7th country) will be funded with non US co-finance sources, and not by the GEF Grant. All countries are aware of the activities being planned.

Corrected. When possible, more quantitative outputs have been included. During PPG phase, when the project development team will be able to define better the scope and details of the project activities, specific quantitative indicator targets will be included.

Corrected. Included additional text in Section C, to describe what each Component will be delivering.

National hubs refer to national stakeholder platforms that the project will facilitate. Those platforms will include private and public sector representatives from key sectors such as marine, planning, environment, health, etc. The platforms will also include representation from resilient reef communities in each country. The stakeholder platforms or hubs will lead the planning process under Outcome 2.2.

The baseline scientific research identified the resilient reefs globally, based on geographic, oceanographic, and climatic parameters, that have the capacity to survive to climate change effects and regenerate coral reefs globally once the climate stabilizes. Component 1 and 2 will be implemented for the benefit of all the identified resilient reefs, in each of the 6 countries. However, due to budgetary restrictions, from the initial set of resilient coral reefs, the project will select, during PPG phase and early stages of project execution, a subset of sites where the project will focus the activities of Component 3 (Financial solutions for resilient Coral Reef Rescue) interventions.

Additionally, based on a recent assessment of the project scope and budget available from GEF grant, Output 2.2.3 has been removed from the Table B. This activity will be covered through co-financing sources.

Addressed. CCRES tools are an important baseline of this project and this has been referenced in the PIF scope and baseline sections.

Budget has been revised to place strong emphasis on Component 2. Furthermore, during project development phase, once the specific activities have been defined, we will be able to provide a more detailed budget.

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?	
10/01/2020	10/10/2020
Yes, However, please note that there seems to be an interesting overlap between the project's baseline and the cofinancing sources. Please be aware that cofinancing is cofinancing to the project, Baseline is what the project will be building on.	Agreed. We have corrected the baseline section.
Core indicators	
6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)	
10/01/2020	10/10/2020
Partly, please consider if core indicator 2, 4 or both would relevant. It seems from a quick assessment that at least core indicator 4 would be highly relevant.	Thank you for this feedback. The project will not be creating new protected areas or improving management of existing marine protected areas. Thus, the project will not be using core indicator 2. Regarding Core Indicator 4, the project is not going to directly invest on activities on the ground. It is going to create technical capacities, facilitate implementation of monitoring an decision support tools, create national strategies for resilient coral reef conservation, and develop private investments portfolios that are ready to be executed during or after the project is finished (with support from co-finance sources). The elaboration of management plans is also out of the scope of the project, due to the limited project budget. That is why we cannot claim that the project will have direct impact on improving the management of certain landscapes.
10/15/2020	10/16/2020
Please reassess core indicator 7.4. It seems strange that the project already at PIF stage can be at 2, when project not even has started yet.	Thanks for the observation. The figure has been corrected.
Project/Program taxonomy	
7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?	

<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>Please ensure that taxonomy includes Large Marine Ecosystems, SIDS (Solomon Island is part taking in the project), Mangroves and Sea grasses are often part of healthy coastal ecosystems, hence they may very well be part of the investment either directly or indirectly.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Thank you for this feedback, these have been included.</p>
<p>Part II ? Project Justification</p> <p>1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>Partly, the investment rationale from the IW focal area is the transboundary agreement that exists within the Large Marine Ecosystems. Please make sure this is much more front and center of the proposal.</p> <p>10/15/2020</p> <p>The relevant LMEs have been mentioned. Please note that the Sulu Celebes SAP and Indonesian LME SAP are very close to being finalized. Hence please keep these two regional SAPs in mind during PPG.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Thank you for this comment, this has been corrected. Reference to LME SAPs have been included in project scope, project baseline, alignment to GEF focal area, and coordination sections</p> <p>10/16/2020</p> <p>Will do, thanks.</p>
<p>2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?</p>	

<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>NO, Baseline is NOT the same as co-financing resources. Please ensure that the baseline section includes the baseline investments and activities (nationally, regionally, and globally) that the proposed investment will be building on.</p> <p>Further, please ensure that baseline investments such as the relevant LME SAPs, CRESS, national, regional and global programs are included. Eg the Blue Nature Alliance, as that clearly will be providing part of the baseline to be building on.etc etc.</p> <p>What is currently included is a description of the cofinancing compilation and a generic description of the partnership. please move this elsewhere</p> <p>10/15/2020</p> <p>The baseline still includes investments that have also been listed as co-financing. Please make sure this is not the case.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Thank you very much for your feedback, the Baseline section has been improved, including, as much as possible, the list of projects and Initiatives, at the global, regional and country levels, that the proposed project will be building on. The list is not exhaustive and will continue to be built during project development phase.</p> <p>10/16/2020</p> <p>Please see the improved section. The only initiative that is both listed in the co-finance and baseline sections is the Allen Coral Atlas, by Vulcan. This is going to be both an important co-financing Initiative and a strong baseline tool that the project will utilize, build on and complement.</p>
<p>Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>No, this needs to be strengthened considerable.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Thank you for this observation, this section has been developed.</p>
<p>Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>No. It will be easier for the project proponent to write this up, when the baseline has been identified and described.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Thank you, the baseline and incremental cost reasoning have been improved</p>
<p>Are the project?s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>Yes, but please revise and strongly consider to include 2 and or 4 too</p> <p>10/15/2020</p> <p>ok</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>See comment above about Core Indicators 2 and 4.</p>

Project/Program Map and Coordinates	
Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project/s/program?s intended location?	
10/01/2020	10/10/2020
<p>No, this is a global project, but with specific investments. these will be identified further during PPG.</p> <p>Therefore, please ensure to include geo referenced site information at the time of CEO endorsement</p>	<p>Agreed. We will include this information at CEO Endorsement stage.</p>
Private Sector Engagement	
Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?	
10/01/2020	10/10/2020
<p>No, please expand on this. Considering that Private sector feature in the project taxonomy and in project components, this section need to be expanded upon.</p>	<p>Thank you for this observation, this section has been expanded.</p>
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?	
10/01/2020	10/10/2020
<p>Partly, the project has identified risks and mitigation opportunities. The COVID risk and opportunity analysis is particular detailed. However, the Climate Change risk analysis is too thin. This proposed investment's main objective is to investigate climate impact on reefs and increasing climate resilience in coral reef ecosystems. hence it is strange that proposal only mention one climate related risk, namely unfavorable weather conditions. Please reassess if there are not more climate related risks in relation to project in both short and long term. Please consider if a tool like the world bank's climate change risk assessment tool may be useful. For additional guidance, please consider consulting http://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback which we agree with. This has been corrected. The PIF now includes a Climate Change risk analysis and we have attached a climate change risk assessment, using WWF?s climate risk assessment tool, that we have attached to the PIF.</p>

<p>Coordination</p> <p>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?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>Partly, please that coordination is happening with the Blue Nature alliance, all relevant LMEs and their associated SAPs, IWLEARN. Further, please look into the national GEF investments under eg BD and other FAs, if there are relevant investments in these six countries that should be coordinated with.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Thank you for your comment, this has been corrected. Included reference to coordination with Blue Nature alliance, all relevant LMEs and their associated SAPs, and IWlearn.</p> <p>Included a list of national GEF investments that the project will coordinate with. We will continue populating this list of projects during the project preparation phase.</p>
<p>Consistency with National Priorities</p> <p>Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>partly, Please look into if national Partnership investment frameworks from organizations like the World Bank and other IFIs, may be worthwhile to ensure consistency with.</p> <p>10/15/2020</p> <p>It is noted that the project, during its PPG phase will be undertaking the above-mentioned analysis and associated work. Hence, it needs to be reflected upon at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>Point well taken. During the project preparation phase, the project team will undertake an analysis of IFIs investment frameworks in each of the 6 countries, to ensure coordination and complementary of project activities. Additionally, under Component 3, the project will develop investment frameworks to support implementation of coral reef friendly sustainable business. This activity will be closely coordinated with other organizations active in the sector, including the relevant IFIs in each country.</p> <p>10/16/2020</p> <p>ok</p>
<p>Part III ? Country Endorsements</p> <p>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?</p>	
<p>10/01/2020</p> <p>No, LOEs are still missing, please provide</p>	<p>10/10/2020</p> <p>LOEs have been uploaded to the Portal.</p>

GEF Correspondence and Feedback with UK:

10/2020

GEF ID and link to GEF page	Project Title	Focal Area	Country	Agency	GEF Project Financing USD	UK Comments	GEF Response
10575	Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities	IW	Global (Fiji, Indonesia, Madagascar, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Tanzania)	WWF-US	7,000,000	The summary paragraph doesn't say what the project will do. This is a relatively small amount of money when split over six countries plus a global component. It is unclear what "scalable solutions" the project will showcase.	The sentiment behind this investment is a global analysis, that has revealed that some reefs have a substantially higher coping ability with fluctuating sea temperatures. Approximately 70% of these reef which have higher regeneration potential, are based in the countries of this investment. Hence, the investment will build capacity and develop solutions to ensure the long-term survival of these climate resilient coral reef ecosystems and ultimately seek to understand if there are features or management approaches that can be adopted by other reef systems.

STAP Review of PIF

	Response	
GEF ID	10575	
Project Title	Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities	
Date of Screening	19 November 2020	
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	

STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>The project provides an excellent summary of related multi-stakeholder initiatives (not just individual projects) that provide a foundation for joint action. There is an excellent presentation of data, with references, on trends and on the global importance of reef conservation. There is also a very clear specification of barriers, with global, cross-regional perspective. STAP finds that the project offers commendable, well elaborated thinking regarding the institutional, financial and social sustainability of the investment. The project explicitly uses climate projections as the basis for geographic targeting. It utilizes very good criteria for identifying target sites, integrating aspects of exposure to climate threats, livelihood and food security, capacity to adapt, and local stressors on coral reef health. Finally, STAP finds that the project has a good approach to identifying and synthesizing knowledge from a wide range of sources, not only from project implementation. However, indicators and metrics for knowledge management should be specified.</p>	
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes.
Project Components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, well structured.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes, clear.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Ambitious, but the alliance brings together very capable actors leveraging the latest science. Climate trends and economic drivers present primary challenges.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes, well structured.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e., a theory of change.	

<p>1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)</p>	<p>Is the problem statement well-defined?</p>	<p>Project logic very well substantiated.</p>
	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>Excellent presentation of data, with references, on trends and global importance of reef conservation. Very clear specification of barriers, with global, cross-regional perspective.</p>
	<p>For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well- defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?</p>	
<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly?</p>	<p>Yes, very well substantiated, building upon recent, completed SAPs. Excellent summary of related multi-stakeholder initiatives (not just individual projects) that provide a foundation for joint action.</p>
	<p>Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>For multiple focal area projects:</p>	

	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Clear specification of causal pathways, rooted in action on capacity building and knowledge exchange, national planning, and mobilization of finance. Theory of change diagram shows good interconnections between first- and second-order outcomes targeted and relates these two key threats.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Well specified.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Well specified.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Yes, with good recognition of need for adaptive management during implementation.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Very well specified, contrasting with baseline scenario.

	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes. Good specification of additional co-benefits beyond IW targets, addressing biodiversity, local livelihoods, climate adaptation and carbon capture.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes, and very well specified in relation to global trends so that benefits, if realized, will be clearly pivotal.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Adequate for PIF stage; indicators and methodologies should be further specified prior to CEO endorsement.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Climate aspects well integrated in rationale and focus of activities.

<p>7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up</p>	<p>Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p>	<p>Explicitly uses climate projections as basis for geographic targeting. Very good criteria for identifying target sites, integrating aspects of exposure to climate threats, livelihood and food security, capacity to adapt, and local stressors on coral reef health. Commendable, well elaborated thinking regarding institutional, financial and social sustainability of the investment.</p>
	<p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p>	<p>Excellent, clear specification of scaling strategies, distinguishing replication, financing, and influence on mindsets of decision makers.</p>
	<p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	<p>Fundamental transformation, on an urgent time scale. Clearly articulated.</p>
<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		<p>Global map identifies countries. Lacks geo-referencing at site level.</p>

<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Impressive stages of consultation and alliance-building over the last 2 years described, including excellent integration of civil society stakeholders. Project builds directly on prior, innovative approaches spearheaded by CSOs and research institutes.</p>
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>Well described.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Excellent summary of gender barriers relating to division of labor, access and benefit sharing, including national-level overviews with good referencing. Planned Gender Action Plan usefully anticipates addressing gender divisions in resource management decision-making.</p>

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Yes, well described at this stage, including linkages to indigenous peoples where relevant.
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures: ? How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? ? Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? ? Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? ? What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</p>	Good specification of risks, potential consequences and counter measures. Distinction by level of risk would be helpful in addition. Detailed analysis of climate risks by country, well organized and referenced. Exemplary identification of Covid-19 risks and possible opportunities.
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Consortium of lead organizations provides a strong foundation for knowledge generation and sharing.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Good identification of other GEF-supported projects for coordination.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	As above. Recognition of importance of cross- regional learning and scaling.
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes, knowledge management aspects are well integrated.

<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the Knowledge Management Approach for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>Good approach to identifying and synthesizing knowledge from a wide range of sources, not only from project implementation.</p> <p>Indicators and metrics for knowledge management should be specified.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Good, initial indication of methods and approaches to knowledge sharing, including MOOCs and tool libraries.</p>

GEF Council Comments and Responses

<p>Germany COMMENTS:</p>	<p>WWF GEF Responses</p>
<p>Germany suggests to include members of the communities dependent on coral reefs in the peer-to-peer learning events planned as project output 1.1.1.</p>	<p>We appreciate and fully agree with the importance of ensuring meaningful engagement of local communities in all aspects of the project. This has been addressed in the ProDoc as follows:</p> <p>Under Output 1.1.1 it is stated that "the project will aim to ensure that learning events are accessible to previously marginalized or under-represented groups, designing inclusive strategies and approaches geared towards enabling the participation of women, youth, and people with disabilities". Activities have been intentionally designed to incorporate "community-led learning as well as the use of traditional knowledge in learning processes where appropriate" (Activity 1.1.1.2). This includes identification of "opportunities for community-led learning, as well as the engagement with local knowledge in the potential learning processes and activities" (Activity 1.1.3)</p>

<p>Large parts of the project concentrate on knowledge generation and exchange. Germany would like to point out that the changes in behavior that are necessary in order to reduce the negative effects on coral reefs on site are probably also linked to deep-seated values, beliefs and practices within local communities. Germany suggests to include the consideration of such socio-cultural aspects under outcome 2.2.</p>	<p>The process for planning and the design of the shared vision and agenda for climate refuge reefs is informed by:</p> <p>Traditional knowledge and the vision of local communities for climate refuge reef conservation (gathered under Output 2.1.3). This will ensure that systemic drivers of degradation (including socio-cultural aspects) are identified by the Communities themselves ? with the support of the Technical Working Group.</p> <p>A threat/opportunity analysis which will take into consideration ecological, social as well as economic drivers and draw on both science and traditional knowledge; and</p> <p>A cost benefit analysis that ?takes into consideration social, economic and environmental costs and benefits? (Output 2.2)</p>
<p>Germany suggests to add thoughts on local ownership to the section on ?Institutional Sustainability?.</p>	<p>The project places significant emphasis on local ownership. A core mechanism for realising local ownership in the ProDoc is the establishment of National Hubs which ?provide a long-term mechanism to all for coordinated approaches to the conservation and management of coral reefs amongst this diversity of actors and stakeholders? (Section on Institutional Sustainability). This is described in detail in the ProDoc under Component 2 (Section 2.2.2):</p> <p>?The design of this Component seeks to deliberately promote the longer-term sustainability of the Hub and the Vision for Climate Refuge Reefs. Hubs will be established as a sub-structure within existing platforms and processes in the country (as described in Annex 4). Efforts made to work with the relevant government structures to formally recognize the National Hub and for stakeholder representatives to include it in their annual plans and budgets (Activity 2.1.1.5). Technical and planning processes carried out across the project will use the Hubs as the core mechanism to engage stakeholders and build ownership of the project?s outcomes. Furthermore, a sustainability strategy for the National Hub and National Vision and Action Plan for climate refuge reefs will be developed early on during the project with roll out initiated as soon as possible (Activity 2.2.3.4)?.</p>

UK COMMENTS:	
<p>The summary paragraph doesn't say what the project will do. This is a relatively small amount of money when split over six countries plus a global component. It is unclear what ?scalable solutions? the project will showcase.</p>	<p>The sentiment behind this investment is a global analysis, that has revealed that some reefs have a substantially higher coping ability with fluctuating sea temperatures. Approximately 70% of these reef which have a higher regeneration potential, are based in the countries of this investment. Hence, the investment will build capacity and develop solutions to ensure the long-term survival of these climate resilient coral reef ecosystems, and ultimately seek to understand if there are features or management approaches that can be adopted by other reef systems.</p>
US COMMENTS:	
<p>We recommend potential collaboration with Dr. Al Licuanan of De La Salle University on the use of citizen science to monitor coral reef status and conditions.</p>	<p>Citizen science can be a powerful tool in managing and monitoring coastal ecosystems. In identifying key indicators, management plans and training needs, we plan to include citizen science data as stated in Component 1.2. We will consult with relevant experts in this field and relevant countries, potentially including Dr Licuanan, to ensure the project supports and utilizes citizen science to the greatest extent possible</p>
<p>We are concerned the Philippian Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) is listed as TBC as an executing partner. We would like to see confirmation of that partnership in the next stage of this proposal.</p>	<p>Agreed. DENR has been the lead national entity for the CRR Project during the PPG phase. During the project preparation, under the leadership of DENR several discussions with a technical working group led to an agreement on institutional arrangements for the project in Philippines. In those meetings the Terms of Reference and selection process of the National Technical Facilitators (national executing partners) were agreed upon and DENR BNB designated the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development as the lead potential National executing partner for the project.</p>

<p>This proposal includes a number of excellent institutional and CSO partners. We think it would be advantageous to see these CSO partners further engage with smaller, local organizations to build stronger community engagement.</p>	<p>We fully agree with this suggestion. The National Hub provides the mechanism for engagement of civil society and non-governmental organizations in the technical delivery of the project as well as monitoring, learning, and planning processes. Annex 4 of the ProDoc lists the Community and Non-Governmental Organizations? that have been identified (through stakeholder mapping carried out during the PPG) as being important to be invited to participate as members of the National Hubs. Other organizations may be identified during the analysis and planning processes carried under Component 2 and invited to participate in the National Hubs.</p>
<p>Ships in the Sulu-Celebes Sea are at risk of piracy and armed robbery. We recommend the development of a risk-management strategy for any vessels entering that area.</p>	<p>We appreciate and are grateful for raising this risk. The project is largely focused on the establishing and strengthening processes and policies and it is not expected that a significant level of field work will take place at this stage. The project will be developing plans and mobilizing resources for site-based investments and will incorporate a risk-management strategy for the any actions prioritized for the Sulu-Celebes Sea in the National Action Plans.</p>

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).
(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status
in the table below:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: ?????			
<p><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></p>	<p><i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i></p>		
	<p><i>Budgeted Amount</i></p>	<p><i>Amount Spent To date</i></p>	<p><i>Amount Committed</i></p>

Project Development		???	????	????
	Consultants	87,204?	87,204	0
	Grants	107,796	107,796	0
Gender				
	Consultants	5,000	5,000	0
Total		200,000	200,000	0

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.




Figure 1 Fiji Project Area




Figure 2 Solomon Islands Project Area




Figure 3 Indonesia (a) Project Area




Figure 4 Indonesia (b) Project Area




Figure 5 Philippines Project Area




Figure 6 Madagascar Project Area




Figure 7 Tanzania Project Area

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Budget notes and assumptions #	Component (US\$eq.)								Sub-Total	PMC	Total Project	Responsible Entity <small>(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)</small>		
			Component 1 Global to local capacity strengthening for resilient coral reefs monitoring and conservation		Component 2: Planning for resilient Coral Reef Rescue at the national level		Component 3: Financial solutions for resilient Coral Reef Rescue	Component 4 Knowledge Management & Monitoring and Evaluation								
			TOTAL OUTCOME 1.1	TOTAL OUTCOME 1.2	TOTAL OUTCOME 2.1	TOTAL OUTCOME 2.2	TOTAL OUTCOME 3.1	TOTAL OUTCOME 4.1	TOTAL OUTCOME 4.2 / M&E							
Grants/ Sub-grants			\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sub-grant to NTF Fiji	1	\$ 23,751.00	\$ 12,000.00	234,586	220,000		319,791	43,000	49,947	903,075			903,075	UQID	
	Sub-grant to NTF Solomon Islands	2	\$ 84,753.00	\$ 10,000.00	307,753	226,221		190,753	58,000	25,753	903,233			903,233	UQID	
	Sub-grant to NTF Indonesia	3	\$ 53,752.50	\$ 12,000.00	270,700	175,753		299,253	55,500	36,253	903,210			903,210	UQID	
	Sub-grant to NTF Philippines	4	\$ 33,753.00	\$ 53,200.00	319,300	190,685		159,613	74,600	72,082	903,233			903,233	UQID	
	Sub-grant to NTF Madagascar	5	\$ 76,809.41	\$ 15,153.85	310,190	191,769		214,850	60,005	34,517	903,295			903,295	UQID	
	Sub-grant to NTF Tanzania	6	\$ 25,361.70	\$ 45,869.57	273,276	257,581		159,429	64,334	77,318	903,170			903,170	UQID	
			\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Sub-grants			\$ 298,180.61	\$ 148,223.41	1,715,805	1,262,009		1,343,689	355,439	295,870	5,419,216			5,419,216		
International consultants	Consultant to design, develop and implement MOOCs	7	\$ 140,379.00	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	140,379			140,379	UQID	

	Consultant to support the establishment of climate data platforms with linkages to NOAA and Vulcan - Coral Reef Atlas	8	\$ -	\$ 37,500.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	37,500			37,500	UQID
	Consultant to provide technical advisory support to countries on conservation finance to deliver Component 3 outputs	9	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	300,000	-	-	300,000			300,000	UQID
	Communication Specialist	10	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	60,000			60,000	UQID
	Mid Term and Final Evaluation Consultancies	11	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	75,000			75,000	UQID
Total International Consultants			\$ 140,379.00	\$ 37,500.00	-	-	-	300,000	60,000	75,000	472,500			612,879	
*Salary and benefits / Staff Cost	Project Manager	12	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	330,833			330,833	UQID
	Online learning Technical Specialist	13	\$ 270,740.25	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	270,740			270,740	UQID
	Monitoring and data platforms Technical Specialist	14	\$ -	\$ 155,880.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	155,881			155,881	UQID
	M&E Specialist	15	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	75,000			75,000	UQID
Total Staff Costs			\$ 270,740.25	\$ 155,880.75	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	501,621			832,454	
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Global Annual Reflection Workshops	16	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	80,000			80,000	UQID
Total Trainings, Workshops, Meetings			\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	80,000			80,000	
Travel	Travels Knowledge management team	17	\$ 22,951.00	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	22,951			22,951	UQID
	Attendance of global and regional IW:LEARN events	18	\$ -	\$ -	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000			30,000	UQID
Total Travel			\$ 22,951.00	\$ -	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	52,951			52,951	
Other operational Costs - Audit											2,500			2,500	UQID
Grand Total			\$ 732,250.86	\$ 341,604.16	1,715,805	1,262,009		1,643,689	445,439	525,870	6,526,288			333,333	7,000,000

Budget Notes and Assumptions

1	Fiji Sub Grant	Sub-grant provided to the NTF by the PMU to: Contribute to the development of the Knowledge Proposal (including carrying out needs assessment and stakeholder analysis) and participate in the learning and monitoring under Component 1; Deliver Component 2 and Component 3 (Component 3 will be delivered through global support); and the communications and awareness initiatives, M&E and IW:Learn meetings as well as annual reflection meetings under Component 4. Details on each Component are provided in the ProDoc narrative under Section 2.8.2
2	Solomon Islands Sub Grant	Sub-grant provided to the NTF by the PMU to: Contribute to the development of the Knowledge Proposal (including carrying out needs assessment and stakeholder analysis) and participate in the learning and monitoring under Component 1; Deliver Component 2 and Component 3 (Component 3 will be delivered through global support); and the communications and awareness initiatives, M&E and IW:Learn meetings as well as annual reflection meetings under Component 4. Details on each Component are provided in the ProDoc narrative under Section 2.8.2
3	Indonesia Sub Grant	Sub-grant provided to the NTF by the PMU to: Contribute to the development of the Knowledge Proposal (including carrying out needs assessment and stakeholder analysis) and participate in the learning and monitoring under Component 1; Deliver Component 2 and Component 3 (Component 3 will be delivered through global support); and the communications and awareness initiatives, M&E and IW:Learn meetings as well as annual reflection meetings under Component 4. Details on each Component are provided in the ProDoc narrative under Section 2.8.2
4	Philippines Sub Grant	Sub-grant provided to the NTF by the PMU to: Contribute to the development of the Knowledge Proposal (including carrying out needs assessment and stakeholder analysis) and participate in the learning and monitoring under Component 1; Deliver Component 2 and Component 3 (Component 3 will be delivered through global support); and the communications and awareness initiatives, M&E and IW:Learn meetings as well as annual reflection meetings under Component 4. Details on each Component are provided in the ProDoc narrative under Section 2.8.2
5	Madagascar Sub Grant	Sub-grant provided to the NTF by the PMU to: Contribute to the development of the Knowledge Proposal (including carrying out needs assessment and stakeholder analysis) and participate in the learning and monitoring under Component 1; Deliver Component 2 and Component 3 (Component 3 will be delivered through global support); and the communications and awareness initiatives, M&E and IW:Learn meetings as well as annual reflection meetings under Component 4. Details on each Component are provided in the ProDoc narrative under Section 2.8.2
6	Tanzania Sub Grant	Sub-grant provided to the NTF by the PMU to: Contribute to the development of the Knowledge Proposal (including carrying out needs assessment and stakeholder analysis) and participate in the learning and monitoring under Component 1; Deliver Component 2 and Component 3 (Component 3 will be delivered through global support); and the communications and awareness initiatives, M&E and IW:Learn meetings as well as annual reflection meetings under Component 4. Details on each Component are provided in the ProDoc narrative under Section 2.8.2
7	International consultant - MOOCs	Consultancy to support design, development and delivery of three MOOCs: fixed fee
8	International consultant: Data Specialist	Specialist on the NOAA and Atlas data platforms, responsible for supporting the development of linkages with the Climate Data Platform under the Knowledge Hub (Component 1.2): fixed fee
9	International consultant: Conservation finance	Technical advisory support to countries, involving: i) Conducting the global benchmarking study; ii) Working with countries to develop a common set of criteria and a shared protocol to guide the business models to be used across all 6 countries; iii) Developing the framework for identification and analysis of both small and medium businesses as well as larger businesses; and iv) Provide technical support and backstopping to the in-country consultants and technical working groups. Fixed Fee +
10	International consultant: Communications specialist	Global communications specialist to support countries in the design and delivery of communications and awareness raising activities
11	International consultants:	Evaluation specialists for the Mid and End of term reviews: Fixed fee + travel
12	Project Manager	GEF Project Manager (1FTE dedicated to the project, from which 70% covered by the GEF budget and 30% co-financed by UQID)
13	Technical specialist (Outcome 1.2)	Staff to be recruited under UQ with expertise in on-learning learning (including MOOCs) to coordinate the delivery of the learning events under 1.1: budgeted for 132 weeks over 4 years
14	Technical specialist (Outcome 1.2)	Staff to be recruited under UQ with expertise in data platforms and coral reef monitoring - to coordinate the delivery of outputs under 1.2: budgeted for 76 weeks over 4 years
15	M&E specialist	M&E specialist recruited under the PMU to oversee and coordinate the delivery of M&E activities and outputs (under Component 4.2). 1 FTE to be cofinanced by University of Queensland
16	Convening of global annual reflection workshops	Annual reflection workshops held at the global level (most likely online with the possibility of one face to face meeting) \$20,000/year
17	Travel for design and development of MOOCs	Budget allocated for the UQ team to engage with countries in the design of learning and knowledge products, specifically the MOOCs: 6 trips @ \$3,825
18	Attendance of global and regional IW:LEARN and other relevant fora	Budget allocated for the PMU and members of the Global Steering Committee to attend global and regional IW:LEARN and other relevant IW:Learn related fora 10 trips @ \$3,000
*	A Finance and Operations Manager will be hired and funded through cofinancing from the University of Queensland	

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agency is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).