

Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities

Basic Information

GEF ID

10575

Countries

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

Project Title

Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities

GEF Agency(ies)

WWF-US

Agency ID

WWF-US: G0032

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Christian Severin

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of May 2020 (cseverin): Please acquire missing LOEs and resubmit

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed, all LOEs now uploaded

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please make sure to tag investment as GLOBAL, on the front page, followed by listing the names of the countries that are participating.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please add the countries after GLOBAL on front page.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

9/28/20 - the remaining LOEs are forthcoming

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?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin):Partly addressed. see below:

1) Results framework still mentions seven countries. Please make sure there is consistency between the number of countries that will be invested in and project text submitted in this PIF. This is also still an issue in section C. This project is investing in 6 countries. If other associated/parallel activities relevant to the project is taking place, sure they can be mentioned, but not as part of the description of the activities funded by GEF.

2) the outputs are still not quantitative. It is very hard to see any change from the initial submission. Please have a close look at these and work towards making it easier for the reader to understand what the outputs behind "technical assistance and training" and eg "Consultative and collaborative process" will be delivering.

3) has been adequately described at this point, but at CEO endorsement it needs to be MUCH clearer how the proposed activities will support the overall objective of "safeguarding globally significant climate resilient coral reefs", as most of the activities included seem to be normal coastal zone/coral reef activities.

4 -6: Addressed

7) the revised budget is better, however, it is still believed that a total of more than 2.5 mio (component 1 and 4) for knowledge management is too high, if the project is to be able to deliver on its objective of "safeguarding globally significant climate resilient coral reefs". Please adjust accordingly.

8-9) Addressed

21st of October 2020 (cseverin):No. Most points have been addressed adequately at this stage. It should be mentioned that much work is needed on the output indicators during PPG, as these are still are not strong quantifiable indicators.

Comments 7 seem to have been omitted. Please make sure funding is moved from component 1 and 4 to activities that will more directly deliver towards the objective of "safeguarding globally significant climate resilient coral reefs", such as component 2.

22nd of October 2020 (cseverin): Adequately addressed at this stage, but the funding to component 1 and 4 still is high, unless it during the PPG phase, can be clearly demonstrated, how the activities under component 1 & 4 are directly supporting and advancing the national

activities and the overarching goal of "safeguarding globally significant climate resilient coral reefs". Please work closely with the GEFSEC on securing this alignment during PPG.

Moreover, please note that the project has a dedicated project management budget, and hence cant have another component 4.2 to finance this twice. It is assumed this is a typo and hence it will be removed

Agency Response

10/10/2020- Thank you for your comments,

- 1) This has been 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.
- 2) 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.
- 3) Corrected. Included additional text in Section C, to describe what each Component will be delivering.
- 4) 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.
- 5) 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.

- 6) Addressed. CCRES tools are an important baseline of this project and this has been referenced in the PIF scope and baseline sections.
- 7) 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.
- 8) Revised and corrected.

- 9) Included language in section 3) the proposed alternative scenario.

October 20: We have reviewed the CRR PIF Project budget in Table B, to reduce the budget from Components 1 and 4 and increase the budget in Component 2, as suggested. To reflect better the nature of the C1 we have renamed it to “Global to local capacity building for resilient coral reefs monitoring and conservation” as the component is not only knowledge management, but also capacity building and implementation of coral reef monitoring systems.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, However, please note that there seem 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

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

- 1) For the co-financing from GCF, please use category “donor Agency” and use the name of the institutions that provides the funding (GCF – not WWF-US)
- 2) For co-financing from Blue Action fund, please use category “others” for source, and use the name of the institutions that provides the funding (Blue Action Fund)
- 3) For co-financing from Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies, please use category “others” and not CSO, and use the name of the institutions that provides the funding (Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies – not WWF-US)

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you very much for this feedback, we have corrected the baseline section.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response 10/10/2020- Thank you for this comment

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response 10/10/2020- Thank you for this comment

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response 10/10/2020- Thank you very much for this comment

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October: Partly, please consider if core indicator 2, 4 or both would be relevant. It seems from a quick assessment that at least core indicator 4 would be highly relevant.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

10/10/2020-

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 and 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.

10/16/2020

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?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (Csverin): 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you for this feedback, these have been included.

art II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): The relevant LMEs has 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.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

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.

10/16/2020

Will do, thanks.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

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.

What is currently included is a description of the cofinancing compilation and a generic description of the partnership. please move this elsewhere

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): The baseline still includes investments that have also been listed as co-financing. Please make sure this is not the case.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

10/10/2020

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

10/16/2020

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.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): No, this needs to be strengthened considerable.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you for this observation, this section has been developed.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, it will be easier to assess when when more information on proposed alternative scenario will be provided.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you for this observation, this section has been developed.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): No. It will be easier for the project proponent to write this up, when the baseline has been identified and described.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you, the baseline and incremental cost reasoning have been improved

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, but please revise and strongly consider to include 2 and or 4 too

15th of October 2020 (cseverin); Ok

Agency Response

10/10/2020

See comment above about Core Indicators 2 and 4.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

10/10/2020-

Thank you very much for this comment

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): No, this is a global project, but with specific investments. these will be identified further during PPG.

Therefore, please ensure to include geo referenced site information at the time of CEO endorsement

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Agreed. We will include this information at CEO Endorsement stage.

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

10/10/2020-

Thank you very much for this comment

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

10/10/2020-

Thank you for this comment

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you for this observation, this section has been expanded.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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>

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

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.

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response

10/10/2020

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.

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.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (ceverin), 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.

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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.

Agency Response

10/10/2020

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.

10/16/2020

ok

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you for your comment

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

10/10/2020

Thank you for your comment

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): No, LOEs are still missing, please provide

15th of October 2020 (cseverin) Addressed

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

1) Please make sure all countries that have endorsed the project is listed in the list of countries to have endorsed the project (Part III: Approval/Endorsement By GEF Operational Focal Point(S) And Gef Agency(ies)). The list is currently only listing four countries.

2) LoE of Tanzania: allocations provided in the LoE have to be strictly followed, so there is no possibility of merging funds from one section to another (PPG with fees and/or GEF Financing). We understand this is a mistake, but the Fee allocated by Tanzania for this project (\$630,000) only covers the GEF Financing, not the PPG (\$18,000). A solution can be an email coming from the Tanzanian OFP in which it is clarified that \$200,000 for PPG and \$18,000 for the PPG agency fee should be allocated. Such an email will have to be uploaded in Portal. Alternatively, a new LoE will be required or the Fee has to be lowered.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

10/10/2020

LOEs have been uploaded to the Portal.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

N/A

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of May 2020 (cseverin): No

1st of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

15th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comments.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comment and resubmit

22nd of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comments and resubmit ASAP

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comment and resubmit soonest

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

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		9/28/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		10/10/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		10/16/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		10/22/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Coral reefs are critically important ecosystems which support the livelihoods of coastal communities globally. They provide essential

Coral reefs are critically important ecosystems which support the livelihoods of coastal communities globally. They provide essential habitat for fisheries and tourism along with protection for coastal infrastructure and assets against sea level rise and increasing storm surge, making the socio-economic welfare of coastal communities closely linked with reef health. Despite their importance, coral reefs across the world's oceans are severely threatened by local and global factors and losses have been exacerbated by climate change. In a

1.5°C atmospheric warming scenario, the IPCC has predicted that a further 70-90% of today's coral reefs will be lost. Given the gravity and urgency of the situation, continuing to apply even the most promising solutions in as many locations as possible is no longer sufficient to drive the change required.

A global analysis has revealed that some reefs have a substantially lower exposure to climate change stress due to local oceanographic conditions such as currents and upwelling. Many of these sites are linked to surrounding coral reefs via ocean currents which transport coral larvae and fish. These resilient and connected reefs embody the regeneration potential for the world's reefs once the stresses resulting from climate change have stabilized and are decreasing. Approximately 80% of these resilient reefs are found in developing countries and 90% of those are concentrated in seven countries: Indonesia, Philippines, Cuba, Fiji, Tanzania, Solomon Islands and Madagascar. These countries together hold 70% of the regeneration potential for the world's reefs. All of these resilient reefs are facing decline and loss of resilience due to increasing local pressures. Given their importance as sources of coral reef regeneration in a 'climate stabilized world', supporting the health of these resilient and connected reefs is essential if we are to secure and replenish the world's reefs.

This investment will build capacity and solutions to ensure the long-term survival of climate resilient coral reef ecosystems, thereby supporting the blue economies and communities dependent on these reefs.

The project will be demonstrating scalable solutions to safeguarding globally significant climate resilient coral reefs. This will among others ensure replication of successful local scale innovations through diffusion of ideas through facilitated cross learning between these communities and the global knowledge networks.