



Mainstreaming Climate-Resilient Blue Economy in the BCLME Region (BCLME IV Project)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11282

Countries

Regional (Angola, Namibia, South Africa)

Project Name

Mainstreaming Climate-Resilient Blue Economy in the BCLME Region (BCLME IV Project)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/28/2024

Review completed by PM

11/18/2024

Program Manager

Ines Benabdallah

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

**PIF
CEO**

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 28/09/24:

Yes

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 28/09/24:

Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 28/09/24:

i) Blue and/or ocean economies are used interchangeably across the doc. Reference is later made to the difference between the two definitions. Please use one term/definition consistently throughout the document.

ii) Please rewrite the summary to improve clarity and be more specific about expected outcomes: for example *?The project's conceptual approach underlines ecosystem services as flagship, upon which functioning, and development of blue economy sectors depend.?* What does this mean?

IB - 11/11/24:

General: Please note that the previous submission used the GEF preferred terminology "sustainable blue economy". Specifically in reference to the final sentence, the correct quote should be : "*GEF IW*

Focal Area Objective 1: Accelerate joint action to support a Sustainable Blue Economy" as per the GEF-8 programming directions.

i) Addressed.

ii) Partly. The updated summary does include all project outcomes, it is redundant, for example "introduce climate resilient and sustainably managed fisheries and seafood production" followed by "Furthermore, it is expected that the project will contribute to more sustainable fisheries" later on. Instead of copy-pasting the outcomes, please take the time to consolidate the paragraph on outcomes and reduce the word count.

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

- i) The prodoc and CEO ER have been revised and only the term Blue Economy (BE) is used.
- ii) The mentioned sentence emphasizes the importance of maintaining the steady flow of marine and coastal ecosystem services as the basis of successful blue economy. The summary has been updated to improve clarity and the outcomes of the project have been added.

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

General: Corrected.

i) The summary has been updated

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 28/09/24:

General comments applying to the CEO endorsement document:

- i) The project objective is to mainstream sustainable blue economy principles in the implementation of an updated SAP that has not yet been endorsed by the three project countries. The agency and the BCC must work with the countries to endorse the SAP before project implementation (eg. first disbursement) can start. Without existing political buy-in, significant delays to implementation are expected.
- ii) The project document should make more explicit reference to the findings of the TE of the previous phase (GEF ID 5753). Please indicate how the current project will build on the previous phases and overcome barriers identified in the TE, specifically: lengthy legal/regulatory adoption

processes, lack of communication/awareness at senior government level, lack of financial sustainability of the BCC secretariat, lack of co-finance tracking (only 20% tracked/materialized at TE). Please include a table of TE recommendations and how the current project responds to them/takes them onboard.

iii) Please provide more detail at output level to explain how you'll achieve the outcomes.

iv) Please add responses to comments from council in the responses table (USA and Germany).

v) Outcome 4.2 makes reference to NGI: does NGI refer to non-grant instrument? The project was not confirmed at PIF to use NGI funding. Please note that UNDP is not eligible to accessing certain types of blended finance and thus NGI is not an accessible option; as such could you please explain how GEF funding will be used to invest in the sector and clarify the financial modality the project plans to use? Generally, please revise component 4 to be more specific at output level.

vi) While private sector participation is addressed in their role as a stakeholder key to enhancing ecosystem conservation and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems, through proposing fiscal incentives to encourage uptake of sustainable practices, there is no acknowledgement of the TE recommendation: *"BCC could consider an Eco-Recognition? incentive scheme to encourage companies to support BCC and invite companies to contribute to a BCC Trust Fund."* Please clarify how blue carbon financing are to be used to sustainably finance the long term management of the BCLME and the BCC secretariat.

vii) All external links provided are broken/inactive, please update or remove.

3.a) Please clarify to what end is the project mainstreaming sustainable blue economy principles in SAP implementation.

b)

i) For output 1.4.2: Please clarify what are *"innovative environmentally friendly exploratory and extractive methods and technologies."* ii) Please also state the baseline - please ensure that the outcomes build on previous guidelines.

iii) Please elaborate on the safeguards in place to ensure no negative impacts from the extractives sector.

c) Partially. Please improve the integration of gender in the outputs/outcomes.

d) The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$55,451,027 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,772,551 instead of \$110,000 (which is 0.19%). Please increase.

e) yes

IB - 11/11/24:

i) Addressed and noted.

ii) Addressed.

(iii) Addressed.

(iv) No. Responses to comments from Council are not included in Annex I of the CEO Endorsement Request.

(v) Addressed.

(vi) Addressed.

(vii) No, broken links are still in the results framework table. Please either update or remove.

3.a) No. The comment pertained to the measurability and conciseness of the project objective. Please revise the objective to include "why" sustainable blue economy is being mainstreamed (long term impacts, for example, to improve ocean health, reduce poverty, improve economy etc).

b)

i) Addressed.

- ii) Addressed.
- iii) Partly. Please ensure that safeguards to the environment, public health and livelihoods are also considered, in addition to the duly noted human rights guidelines to businesses and corporations.

(c) Addressed.

(d) Addressed.

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

i) BCC secretariat will ensure member states endorse the updated SAP before project implementation (eg. first disbursement) can start.

(ii) A table of TE recommendations has been added to section A.4 Justification for the project in the CEO GEF ER.

(iii) Activities have been added under each output in the project description section of the CEO ER.

(iv) Responses to comments from council (USA and Germany) have been added in the responses table in the CEO GEF ER.

(v) This was a typing error. All references to NGI have been changes to NGO.

(vi) This text has been added under Component 4 to address the comment: *?This work will also consider the value and feasibility of incentive schemes, and this will include the ?Eco-Recognition? incentive scheme recommended for consideration in the Terminal Evaluation of BCLME III, with a view to encouraging companies to support BCC. This will involve detailed technical feasibility on the requirements and costs for introducing such incentive schemes (development, management, etc.), and in the case of an eco-recognition scheme the value proposition underlying it?.*

(vii) All external links will be removed

3.a) The entire project, in all of its components is meant to mainstream blue economy principles into SAP implementation. Relevant outputs have reference to the SAP objectives. More details can be found in Annex 18.

(b) (i) The wording of Output 1.4.2 has been amended to better reflect the intent of this output, which is to adopt international best management practices that minimize adverse environmental impacts to the marine environment. More details can be found in see Annex 18.

(ii) In terms of baseline, while there are some industries? self-reporting undertaken, there is no formal framework for this and the capacity of the countries to audit and respond to this self-reporting appears to be limited at best or, in some cases, absent. The need for a more structured approach to reporting and monitoring was one of the findings of the *Governance Baseline Assessment and Strategy for Strengthening Ocean Governance in the BCLME Region* prepared for the BCC in 2020. At present it is clear that existing institutional capacity is limited in terms of environmental and compliance monitoring with respect to operational activities of extractive industries. Monitoring is generally undertaken by the industry and there is a need to augment this capacity with government capacity. In this regard, a new Indicator (new #13) has been added under the project Results Framework in the CEO ER to establish the baseline and target for this Output. Finally, BCC commissioned a series of three Good Practice Environmental Guidelines relating to marine minerals, oil and gas and waste management and plastics. These provide examples of international best practice in these three areas

but none of the guidelines have been institutionalized into regulations at the national level. The purpose of Outcome 1.4 is to do just that.

(iii) In terms of safeguards to prevent negative impacts from the extractives sector, the purpose of Output 1.4.2 is to strengthen both the legal and institutional arrangements to ensure that any adverse environmental impacts are minimized to the greatest extent possible. In addition, the project will take into account the [UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights \(Guiding Principles\)](#), the first international instrument to assign companies the responsibility to respect human rights. The Guiding Principles state that governments must put in place good policies, laws, and enforcement measures to prevent companies from violating rights; that companies must refrain from negatively impacting rights even when governments are failing to create or enforce necessary laws; and that victims of corporate abuses must have access to effective remedy. As part of this responsibility, the Guiding Principles require companies to undertake due diligence to identify and manage their negative human rights impacts, and it identifies the 10 most relevant, urgent, and probable human rights impacts for businesses operating in the extractives sector, as well as suggestions and opportunities for positive impact.

(c) The Outcomes and Outputs have been revised to improve gender integration.

(d) The co-financing contribution to PMC has been increased.

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

viii) Now responses to comments from Council are included in Annex I of the CEO Endorsement Request in the portal.

xi) Broken links have been removed from the results framework table.

3.a) The project objective has been revised

iii) This project does not support extractive activities. It rather includes activities that minimize negative impacts of extractive sector on *environment, public health and livelihoods*. See Output 1.4.2. Environmental and social risks relevant to this project are well described in the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) Annex?. As per the discussion with the GEF Sec project focal point, Output 1.4.2 has been revised as follows:

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 28/09/24:

Refer to general comments above.

a) Yes.

b) Partially.

i) While PS participation is addressed in their role as a stakeholder key to enhancing ecosystem conservation and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems, through proposing fiscal incentives to encourage uptake of sustainable practices, there is no acknowledgement of the TE recommendation: ?BCC could consider an ?Eco-Recognition? incentive scheme to encourage companies to support BCC and invite companies to contribute to a BCC Trust Fund.? Please see general comments and show how the stakeholders were engaged in the PPG phase.

ii) It is well noted that the project has elaborated and budget a stakeholder engagement plan (SEP). Please further clarify, describe and incorporate information in the SEP on the role and engagement with specific CSOs, CBOs and community groups and associations. In addition, please complete the ?stakeholder? row in the risk table in the portal

c) Please see above comments on NGI.

IB - 11/11/24:

b)

i) Addressed.

ii) Addressed.

c) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

i) As indicated above, this text has been added under Component 4 to address the comment: *?This work will also consider the value and feasibility of incentive schemes, and this will include the ?Eco-Recognition? incentive scheme recommended for consideration in the Terminal Evaluation of BCLME III, with a view to encouraging companies to support BCC. This will involve detailed technical feasibility on the requirements and costs for introducing such incentive schemes (development, management, etc.), and in the case of an eco-recognition scheme the value proposition underlying it?.* A total of 375 stakeholders including 10 private sector actors were consulted throughout the PPG phase (see Table 1 in SEP that identified the role of respective stakeholders in the project implementation).

i) The information on the role and engagement with specific CSOs, CBOs and community groups and associations has been now incorporated in the the SEP.

c) All references to NGI (typing error) have been corrected to NGO. See response above.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been

selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 28/09/24: Refer to general comments above.

A) No assumptions are included, although they are mentioned in the results framework. Please integrate across this section.

B)

i) Please make sure that this section includes a narrative on why the SAP has not yet been endorsed, and how this will be achieved before implementation begins, to clearly demonstrate building on previous investments.

ii) Though relevant ongoing projects are mentioned under the strategy section, this is included under project rationale, as 'justification for the project?'. Please bring it down to this section and integrate mentions under relevant components.

iii) Please include clearer references to the outcomes of the last phase (BCLME III) such as the guidelines documents produced on SAP implementation (Minerals guidelines, oil and gas, plastic pollution discharge) and how these will be mainstreamed in components 1 and 3.

C) In addition to the above comments and the general comments, please include a baseline scenario for the BCC and present the alternative scenarios.

D) No. Please revise to include a more robust incremental cost reasoning.

E) Yes.

F) PMC should be revised. see comments below on budget.

G) Please explain how the project intends to address TE recommendation on sustainable financing for the BCLME.

H) Partially. The role of coastal communities is evident in components 1 and 2 but less so for the remaining 3 components. Please include more explicitly in the remaining components.

I) Partially.

i) The gender action plan (annex 9) is noted. In project outputs which mention "with a gender-sensitive approach" please ensure in the corresponding activities in the Results Framework that there are indicators to measure what gender-sensitive approach means.

ii) Please integrate gender dimensions in 4.2, ensuring that women or women's cooperatives /associations are among the stakeholders consulted and that they are beneficiaries of any finance mechanisms to be developed.

iii) In Output 5.2.2, please ensure that best practice examples and lessons learned in advancing gender equality outcomes are captured, and widely shared including through the IW:LEARN platform.

iv) On M&E, please ensure that gender-related results are monitored and regularly reported on.

J) Please include the expected outcomes and outputs for M&E in the Project description overview.

K) Please explain how proposed activities will promote policy coherence.

L) Partially. The uptake of innovative blue carbon finance options could be promising but needs to be more specific. Please indicate how these will be scaled up.

IB - 11/11/24:

A) Addressed.

B)

i) No. The first sentence under the Strategy section states: "*As already highlighted, the updated BCLME SAP was developed and politically endorsed and, to date, continues to provide a strategic guidance for regional collective action towards sustainable utilisation of coastal and marine resources.*" This is in direct contradiction with the response and the paragraph added later on in the section. Please remove and move the response paragraph to the top of the section.

ii) Addressed.

iii) Addressed.

C) Addressed. Please note that the CEO ER template has to be filled in according to the provided guidance in the future.

D) Addressed.

F)

G) Addressed.

H) Addressed.

I)

i) Addressed.

ii) Addressed.

iii) Addressed.

iv) Addressed.

J) Addressed.

K) Addressed.

L) Addressed.

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

A) Assumptions have been integrated in the Project Description section

B)

This paragraph has been added under the Strategy section to address the comment: *“The updated SAP has been validated in a validation workshop by technical teams from the 3 participating countries and it is currently in the process of being formally signed by the ministers of the three countries. There has always been a political will and commitment from the Parties to the BCC and the Parties are in full support of the Project. It is expected that the updated SAP will be adopted before actual start of the implementation of the BCLME IV project, therefore build-up to the previous GEF investments in the region will be secured?”.*

ii) Reference to the baseline projects added in description of Components 1 and 2 of the project, where they are relevant. Section *“Justification for the project?”* was moved to the Project Description section.
iii) These references have been added under the project components 1 and 3. Annex 18 details further how they are mainstreamed in project activities.

C) Baseline scenario and alternative scenario are already described in the ER. The baseline scenario is in the first part of the project description (under Justification for the project), while the alternative scenario is described in the Strategy of the project.

D) Incremental cost reasoning has been added to the Project Description section

F) Revised (see above)

G) Responses to all TE recommendations have been given in Justification for the Project Section (see Agency Response above)

To address this comment, this text has been added under the description of components:

1 Component 3, Outcome 3.2: *“Community level stakeholder engagement will be focused at this outcome to create awareness on mechanisms to reduce discharge of pollutants from land-based activities in priority areas. Activities related to community awareness, training and capacity building on pollution management will be undertaken in selected communities along the BCLME coast. Local authorities and municipalities where the demonstration pilots will be located will support implementation of project activities and collaborate with project teams?”.*

1 Component 4: *“Important dimension of the project will be ensuring a rigorous process of mapping blue economy finance needs, looking at international good practice (in particular delivery and finance models) and a focus on testing pilot models that benefit coastal communities to prepare for scaling-up?”.*

1 Component 5: *“coastal communities will be involved in capacity building and knowledge sharing initiatives. Communication and outreach programmes for awareness raising will be implemented amongst local communities as part of the project communications strategy?”.*

D)

- i) The revision has been effected in the following documents, CEO ER, ProDoc and the GAP to ensure that the gender sensitive indicators are consistent in all three documents. Additional gender targets are also inserted.
- ii) The following gender dimensions are included under output 4.2 in both the CEO ER, ProDoc and the GAP.
 - ? Women will be involved in the consultations to design finance mechanisms (e.g., for benefit sharing agreements) as well as in the management of the finance mechanisms;
 - ? Gender and inclusion specific requirements will be considered in selecting blue carbon / conservation projects to receive funding from the finance mechanisms;
 - ? A percentage of the blue carbon / conservation project developers that receive funding from the finance mechanisms will be women led and/or will employ a majority of women; and
 - ? A percentage of blue carbon / conservation projects will have a specific gender approach and aim for gender impacts.
- iii) Information under output 5.2.2 has been updated in the CEO ER, ProDoc and the GAP gender indicators and targets are inserted to address the comment.
- iv) The M&E component is inserted to be a cross cutting issue in the entire project cycle.
 - ? Ensure gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation across all components of the project's implementation and impact, and dissemination of gender-disaggregated data, including the IW-Learning platforms

J) Outcome and Outputs added to the Project Description Overview

K) This text has been added in the CEO ER and the Prodoc to address the comment: *?One of the basic principles in the foundations of this project is one of the policy coherence. It is implemented in this project by achieving mutual consistency between the policies. None of the policies proposed contradicts other. All key policy coherence aspects were respected throughout the project structure, namely: integrated management; cross-sector collaboration; long-term planning where relevant; stakeholder engagement, in particular through well elaborate Stakeholder Engagement Plan; and monitoring and evaluation. Strict implementation of the above aspects will secure policy coherence?.*

L) This text has been added in the CEO ER and Prodoc to address the comment: *?An important dimension to this will be a rigorous process of mapping of Blue Economy finance needs, looking at international good practice (in particular delivery and finance models) and a focus on testing pilot models to prepare for scaling-up. This work will be linked close to the work on BCLME IV sustainability and the financial sustainability of the BCC Secretariat, as well as a strategic and sustainability-oriented focus to the work on private sector engagement. Central to this will be using pilot testing of models to also pilot deployment, possible through a new mechanism/platform created to co-ordinate with private sector companies to support effective private sector engagement?.*

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

B)

i) Addressed.

C) Noted

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

A) Please include the funds flow in the current diagram.

B) No. please confirm that UNDP is not proposing any agency execution support.

C) No ? please refer to above comments on building on past existing investments/projects/programs and explain how coordination and cooperation will take place.

IB - 11/11/24:

A) Addressed.

B) Addressed.

C) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

A) The funds flow has been added as a separate diagram in the CEO ER.

B) It is stated in the CEO ER that UNDP will play no role in the execution of the project.

C) The text on the project alignment with country/regional priorities has been added.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

A) No.

i) Please include MPA ID for Namibia's Marine Protected Area (CI 5.2)

ii) Please provide the WDPA ID and METT score under core indicator 2.2.

iii) Please provide WDPA ID for Marine OECMs supported under core indicator 5.3

B) The targets at CEO endorsement for core indicators 7 and 11 are missing where they were identified at the PIF stage. Please double check if this is an oversight.

IB - 11/11/24:

A) No. Please provide the WDPA IDs as requested above (see screenshots). Please note that GEB information must be accurate in the CEO ER, not just the annexes.

B) Addressed.

Indicator 5.3 Marine OECMs supported ⓘ

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Namibe EBSA		752,770.00	752,770.00		
Orange Cone EBSA		157,915.00	157,915.00		
Orange Seamount and Canyon Complex EBSA		1,463,370.00	1,463,370.00		

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness ⓘ

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
1,919,810.00	949,700.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF) ⓘ	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at TE) ⓘ	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)
			1,919,810.00					
Namibia's Marine Protected Area		Protected Landscape/Seascape		949,700.00				

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response
9 November 2024

A)

- i) MPA ID for Namibia's Marine Protected Area (CI 5.2) has been added.
- ii) The WDPA ID and METT score under core indicator 2.2 has been added.

B) The targets at CEO endorsement for core indicators 7 and 11 have been added.

UNDP Response
15 November 2024

A)

i) MPA ID for Namibia's Marine Protected Area (CI 2.2) is now in the CEO ER in the portal

ii) Please provide the WDPA ID and METT score under core indicator 2.2. are now in the portal

iii) WDPA ID for Marine OECMs supported under core indicator 5.3 are now in the portal

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

A) No.

- i) Please provide specific mitigation measures for all identified risks to address TE recommendations, eg. on sensitizing project stakeholders and government officials continuously due to turnover.
- ii) Please include potential risks under financial and business model, as many of the interventions proposed are related to sustainable blue economy and the uptake of innovative blue finance (component 4) and the TE provided commendations on financial sustainability.

B) No.

- i) Please adjust the rating under the ?Environmental and Social? risk category in line with the ESS risk category. The ratings are not in line as is. Doing so would be in line with the description of the ?Environmental and Social? risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: ?The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage.?
- ii) Please describe how the Overall risk rating and Financial and Business Model were identified.

C) We note that the project?s overall ESS risk is classified as high/substantial, and UNDP attached the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (Annex 8) with budget, timeframe and expected action. The ESIA/ESMP will establish mitigation measures to ensure proper waste management associated with these activities. An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) and Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) will be included in the ESMP. However, the environmental and social risk section of the Key risks table in the Portal is ?moderate?, and mitigation measures described in SESP is not consistent the ?Explanation of risk and mitigation measures? in the table.

- i) Please revise the environmental and social risk rating and include a summary of mitigation measures in the SESP in the table to make it consistent with the SESP.

IB - 11/11/24:

A)

- i) Addressed.

ii) No, not included, see screenshot for reference. Please include potential risks for finance and business model.

Financial and Business Model		
-------------------------------------	--	--

B)

i) Addressed.

ii) Addressed.

C)

i) Addressed.

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

i) Specific mitigation measures for all identified risks have now been added in the CEO ER.

ii) The potential risks on financial and business model have been added in the CEO ER.

B)

i) The risk Rating has been adjusted.

ii) Financial and Business Model risks were identified considering the proposed Output 4.2 where even blue carbon finance models and options are considered to be developed and implemented and the blended finance options between the public and private sector. As this represents new funding sources and will engage new financing partners to support the implementation of activities promoted by the project. This category also covers the risk related to the uncertainty of success from this new blue economy model.

The overall Risk rating of the project was conducted according to UNDP Guidelines. The SESP was preceded by an Initial Social and Environmental Risk Screening undertaken during PIF development, then updated and finalized following the national workshops during PPG. It has been conceived according to the following principles:

Do not Assume Away Risks

Impact and probability have been rated as if mitigation measures will not be applied, thinking ?worst case scenario?.

Rate Risks Appropriately

Risk significance levels have not been underestimated ? to be accurate, the most likely risk levels have been identified.

Categorize Based on Highest Risk

The overall categorization has been accurately assigned by using the highest individual risk rating.

During implementation, the project will be re-screened with the UNDP SESP as needed in the course of required assessments, when determined necessary by the respective Project Manager (after consideration of the advice from PMO staff with responsibility for safeguards), the Project Steering Committee, and/or when project circumstances change in a substantive or relevant way.

C

- i) The environmental and social risk rating has been revised and a summary of mitigation measures have been added in the table of the CEO ER to make it consistent with the SESP.

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

A)

iv) The risk for finance and business model has been added.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please address NGI comments above.

IB - 11/11/24:

Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

Addressed as explained above. NGI Changed to NGO

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

a) Yes.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

See general comment on the need for SAP endorsement.

Please include a narrative on how the activities for Namibia align with their NBSAP or have CBD relevance, accounting for the use of STAR BD resources.

IB - 11/11/24:

The response is noted but the CEO ER only states: "*Namibia's Second NBSAP has several strategic goals that emphasize the need for conservation and protection of coastal and marine biodiversity and which give enough justification for the use of Namibia's STAR BD resources.*" Please include the below paragraph in the CEO ER to give a more complete answer.

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

Response on the need for the SAP endorsement has been provided above.

The narrative below on how the activities for Namibia align with their NBSAP or have CBD relevance, accounting for the use of STAR BD resources has been added in the CEO ER: *The Namibia's Second NBSAP has several strategic goals that emphasise the need for conservation and protection of coastal and marine biodiversity. Thus, for example, the Strategic Goal B has as one of its targets "By 2022, all living marine and aquatic resources are managed sustainably and guided by the ecosystem approach" (Target #5), while Strategic Goal C has as one of the targets "by 2020, coastal and marine areas, of particular importance to biodiversity and ecosystem services, are identified and measures for their protection initiated" (Target #10). The above provides enough justification for the use of Namibia's STAR BD resources under this component specifically for Output 1.2.1 and Output 1.2.2.*

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

The whole text on NBSAP taken back and other text under the same section reduced to keep the total number of words to 500 as per the portal requirement.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please elaborate on Namibia specific alignment due to STAR BD resources.

IB - 11/11/24:

See comment above.

IB - 18/11/24:

All comments are addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

See above

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please provide a coherent narrative on the role of civil society.

IB - 11/11/24:

Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

The narrative has been added in the CEO ER.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Yes.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please share a list of stakeholders engaged during PPG.

IB - 11/11/24:

Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

The file of lists of stakeholders engaged during PPG will be shared under this resubmission.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Yes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

The STAR allocation table is blank, please revise to include the 1.7M BD STAR from Namibia.

IB - 11/11/24:

GEF Sec is working on it.

IB - 18/11/24:

Technical issue addressed and BD STAR entered.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

The table could not be revised as GEF Portal is giving error message. We have raised the query to the GEF/WB IT, but we have not received feedback yet.

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

The BD STAR has been entered into the portal for an amount of \$1,683,559.00, which represents the remaining available balance for Namibia.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please see comment above about BD/Namibia STAR allocation.

IB - 11/11/24:

GEF Sec is working on it.

IB - 18/11/24:

Technical issue addressed and BD STAR entered.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

Please see response above.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

N/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

N/A

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

N/A

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

A) No

i) Please specify what were the tasks of the team leader?

ii) Please clarify what an SES expert is?

iii) Miscellaneous expenses are not an eligible activity to be funded by the GEF. Please request provide more detail as to what these entail.

iv) Please explain what the professional services entail?

v) Once the above explanations are provided, please use the eligible categories as included in the Guidelines.

IB - 11/11/24:

A) Yes.

i) Addressed.

ii) Addressed.

iii) Addressed.

iv) Addressed.

v) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

A)

i) The role of the Team Lead has been added

ii) SES whole words have been added (Social and Environmental Safeguards)

iii) Miscellaneous expenses have been removed from the table.

iv) The professional services are related to undertaking the capacity assessment of the Executive Agency (the HACT of the BCC Secretariat)

v) Done

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

The STAR allocation table is blank, please revise to include the 1.7M BD STAR from Namibia.

IB - 11/11/24:

GEF Sec is working on it.

IB - 18/11/24:

Technical issue addressed and BD STAR entered.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

STAR Allocation table could not be revised as GEF Portal is giving error message. We have raised the query to the GEF/WB IT, but we have not received feedback yet.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please submit the cofinancing letter for Municipality of Walvis Bay amount of USD 300,000 or remove it if it is indicative.

IB - 11/11/24:

Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

The letter is shared.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

N/A

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please upload all letters as a single document.

IB - 11/11/24:

Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

Letters are uploaded.

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

a) Yes.

b) The indicators try to measure multiple things, please revise to focus on either develop or implement and make sure that the indicators and the means of verification are consistent across the framework.

For example: in outcome 4.1 baseline policies exist but the indicator includes "policies developed and/or strengthened"; or indicator #23 and means of verification (reports presenting the viable mechanisms/ tools for blue/ocean finance) for outcome 4.2 do not clearly convey blue finance and/or blue carbon financing pilot results will be taken up.

c) Partially. Indicator #22 is missing a disaggregated target for women stakeholders consulted/trained, please revise.

IB - 11/11/24:

b) Addressed.

c) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

b) Indicators have been revised

c) Indicator #22 has been added and text revised.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

Please add the geolocations of MPAs and other activities where project implications are known.

IB - 11/11/24:

Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

Geolocations of MPAs and other activities have been added.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

A) Please use the GEF budget template and upload it as an annex in the CEO endorsement. The Operations team needs to review a project budget before clearing and the budget should also be included and public in the CEO endorsement document. Please note that below comments on budget are preliminary and that a full review will be undertaken upon resubmission.

B) No.

i) Please disaggregate the national and international consultant budget lines into separate individual consolidated lines to clearly show how they are charged against the components and PMC.

ii) Please clarify/ separate percentages/amounts for PMC allocation for individual staff being hired in the PMU.

ii) Please clarify what "being paid as regular salary" means in the context of national and international consultants.

iii) Please justify the excessive allocation of budget to travel (1.9 million) and how this is considered cost-effective for achieving project outcomes/objective.

3. According to the TORs of the CTA, 20% of the duties will be charged under PMC, which represents around \$60,000 of the total expected salary for 6 years (around \$300,000). However, 100% is being charged to project components in the budget table. Please amend.

Above duties will be charged under Project Management Cost: 20% of the time

CTA will participate with a technical advice to the following technical activities:

- Technical assistance to MSP process
- Methodological guidance of the NIMPA demo project
- Methodological guidance of the Orange Cone demo project
- Prepare intervention strategy for Saldanha Bay
- Preparation of assessment report, presentation and dissemination of results on innovative BE financial mechanisms and tools

Technical Advice to be charged under project components: 80% of the time (54% for Component 1; 7% for Component 3; and 19% for Component 4).

4. \$802,550 are set aside for different equipment. Several of these budget lines seem redundant or lack the description of the equipment needed. Please provide a detailed description of the different equipment to better assess the differentiators for each item.

IB - 20/11/24:

a) The updated budget shows a large allocation to project staff salaries (total of US \$1,943,200). Salaries across staff equals approximately 20% of project resources. This is excessive, please revise down or increase the amount of co-financing to these positions.

b) Specifically, the TORs show overlap in the roles of Project Manager and the Chief Technical Advisor, where the CTA is acting as backstop to the PM - Please justify why two senior positions are needed. Please consider merging and consolidating these positions into one project manager position to reduce the cost.

1. Addressed.
2. Addressed.
3. Addressed.
4. Addressed.

IB - 21/11/24: Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

9 November 2024

A) Done

B)

i) Will be done in the GEF Budget template

ii) The PMC cost (5%) is not enough to fully cover the salaries of the PCU staff. Since all of the technical staff, including the project manager, will also be involved in the implementation of some of the technical activities of the project, part of their salaries is proposed to be covered from the activities budget. The salary of the administrative staff will be fully covered from the PMC as they will not be involved in the implementation of the technical activities of the project.

iii) The travel cost within the region is quite high (DSAs and airfares) and this has been taken in consideration. Project envisages a number of national and regional meetings, field trips and surveys, as well as travel of international experts into the region. These costs have been adequately assessed.

iv) All documents have to be translated in Portuguese, while for meetings where Portuguese experts participate and when the international experts travel to Angola, the interpretation including renting of adequate equipment has to be secured.

C)

i) The TOR have been updated to address the comment.

ii) PMC co-financing has been revised.

UNDP Response

15 November 2024

A) GEF budget template with expenditure per outcome now used.

B) For the local (240,000) and international consultant (128,000) budget lines, correct account codes have been assigned with percentages and descriptions to clearly show how they are charged against PMC.

UNDP Response

20 Nov 2024

1. Addressed. Each Project Staff salary is inserted as single budget line. Descriptive text was also removed.
2. Addressed. The \$128,000 was for both Project Manager (\$68,000) and CTA (\$60,000). This is clarified by inserting each position in single budget line.
3. Addressed. CTA budget is inserted as single budget line which shows that \$60,000 is charged against PMC.
4. Addressed. Further details added to the budget descriptions. The Government of Angola requests that for all regional and national meetings, conferences, workshops, training courses, consultant missions, and similar events involving Angolan experts, interpretation services into Portuguese be provided. This includes the rental of interpretation equipment, services, and premises. Costs for these services may vary depending on factors such as the number of participants, the geographic location of the event, the type of interpretation required, and the presence of international experts.

Agency Response

21 November 2024

The position of the CTA has been removed and the budget allocated to the project activities.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24:

N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IB ? 30/09/24: No, please address comments above and resubmit for review.

IB - 11/11/24: No, please address comments above and resubmit for review.

IB - 18/11/24: No, please address comments above and resubmit for review.

IB - 20/11/24:No, please address comments above and resubmit for review.

IB - 21/11/24: Yes.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The first priority should be the political endorsement of the updated SAP. The buy-in from the three ministers is foundational to transboundary cooperation of the BCLME and the outcomes and objective of this project. The Implementing Agency and the Benguela Current Convention Secretariat

(EA) must work with the countries to endorse the SAP before project implementation (eg. first disbursement) can start. Without existing political buy-in, significant delays to implementation are expected.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/8/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/19/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/20/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/21/2024	