

# Facilitating dialogue and strengthening transboundary cooperation with legislators to improve marine governance

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10426

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Facilitating dialogue and strengthening transboundary cooperation with legislators to improve marine governance

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

11/4/2019

**Review completed by PM**

1/24/2020

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I – Project Information

**1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, the original concept that was discussed was to catalyze political attention and momentum to support implement of the regionally agreed LME Strategic Action Programmes. The current iteration of the document is focusing too much on identifying and describing how this investment will support and be aligned with the implementing agency's existing programs. While this may be important for sustainability, we need to have this concept reformulated to bring its previous focus back and ensure that the project will be aligned with a number of other activities too.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Yes

## **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019:**

The original concept for the project promoted transboundary cooperation through a focus on oceans issues in conservation caucuses and each target country, scaling up to have tangible environmental and social benefits for regional LMEs- as such, the project will need to coordinate with numerous other transboundary projects, to include both the LME SAPs and other regional processes/programs which the caucus model can support. Ultimately, the caucus model relies on legislative members to identify priorities and conservation issues, and therefore the specific targets of the outcomes are yet to be determined by the members themselves. Additional language on the SAPs has been added throughout the document, as this would be a natural place for the priorities to come from, and other relevant programs will also be included to address this.

As rightly stated above, the connection with the regional seas was added in order to ensure sustainability and anchor it to a regional process. However, the comment is duly noted and the project will also ensure close coordination with GEF funded LME SAP projects and other regional processes/programs.

**2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12th of November 2019 (cseverin): No:

- 1) it is essential to have the proposal CLEARLY state the objective (and hence activities need to reflect upon that) of supporting countries in the road towards formulation of sustainable blue economic development paths, through implementation of LME SAPs by catalyzing political momentum and action.
- 2) Please incorporate wording that will indicate that the project will seek opportunities to support engagement with the members of the High Level Panel for Sustainable Ocean Economy, as there are a number of these members that falls within the proposed geographical focus areas of this project.
- 3) Plastic seems to be mentioned a number of places in the project including in the tags. The investment is not to support plastic investments. If the project have activiteis within these subject, please us cofinancing to address this.
- 4) Please work through the outcome and output indicators to make them quantifiable. some of them already are, others can be improved in this regard.
- 5) Under Project justification. It is fine to mention differetn initiatives that the project will be aligned with, such as the GPA and regional seas (but since the project is not to support plastic work, there may not be a need to include the GPML). However, it seems that the project justification is not touching upon other essential initiatives in the marine space, the regional fisheries management organisations, and guidelines such as small scale fisheries guidelines, port state measurement

agreement, UNDPs Ocean and Water Program, World Banks PROBLUE, ADBs Healthy Oceans Action Plan etc. Please describe how this project will be working along side these initiatives too. Please make sure that these different sets of activities are both reflected upon in section 1 and 2 of the project justification.

(It is noted that some of these initiatives have been described in the regional annexes of the request for CEO Endorsement document uploaded to the portal, but please also make sure that the gist of these are to be found in the portal submission)

6) under section 2 of the project justification, instrumental investments in the GEF portfolio seems to not appear, such as PEMSEA, CLME, CREW and IWECO,

7) under section 3, paragraph, please edit sentence so it reads "They will also greatly increase understanding of topics of importance to the GEF and UN Environment, such as sustainable blue economy, including nutrient pollution, healthy ocean ecosystems, sustainable fisheries and ocean governance practices."

8) under component 1 description, output 1.1.4: please add other essential initiatives here, the project is not to only work in close partnership with UNEP run programs. Please add other examples such as GEF LME investments, UNDPs Ocean and Water Program, World Banks PROBLUE, ADBs Healthy Oceans Action Plan, High Level Panel of Sustainable Ocean Economy etc. Further, please delete (and plastic) from this output and instead add "sustainable blue economy, including nutrient pollution, healthy ocean ecosystems, sustainable fisheries and ocean governance practices".

9) under 1.2.23rd paragraph, please add to sentence so that it reads "In Addition, CCN will work with policymakers "to develop 2 national action plans and/or strategic agendas/road maps per region (that will be informed by the ministerially endorsed SAPs) focused on enabling....."

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Partly addressed. Please include wording in the project objective that makes it clear that the investment will be stimulating LME SAP implementation through working with national caucus.

13th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please ensure that the new objective is reflected upon throughout the project document.

8th of January 2020 (cseverin): Please provide a ProDoc and upload into portal.

24th of January 2020 (cseverin): Request for CEO Approval Package uploaded in portal, budget is part of the Annexes that are uploaded too

7th of February 2020 (cseverin): Please remove specific reference to specific countries in the results framework, to avoid having to acquire endorsement letters.

18th of February 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

26th November 2019:

- 1) The purpose of the project is to leverage the caucus model to promote transboundary cooperation and political will for improved management of marine resources. The strategy will begin at the national level in identified countries focusing on national legislation/policy/action plans to achieve the priorities identified by member legislators. The strategy then scales up to convene regional stakeholders to address and promote regional cooperation and action towards the goals and commitments of regional bodies, such as LME SAPs and others. The ICCF Group Caucus Model operates by supporting conservation priorities identified by its legislative members, which as much as possible is driven by the members themselves. Only when the ICCF Group is asked as the secretariat to assist or provide guidance can it suggest topics of interest. As a foreign-based secretariat, the ICCF Group does not and cannot dictate the agenda for caucuses. Recognizing that the priorities and commitments of legislative bodies can in some cases differ from other government entities in the same country, it would be premature to commit to developing legislative action in specific support of any agreements without knowing whether the legislative bodies of the participating countries have also committed to them- for example, the SAPs are approved at the ministerial level, not the parliamentary level, and consultations with Parliamentary members on the SAPs will need to be held before committing to work with policymakers to develop outcomes specifically informed by the SAPs. This being said, the SAPs are likely to contain issue areas of interest to members and as such will likely contribute to the priorities identified by members. Please note that language pertaining to support the SAP implementation projects has been added to proposed activities.
- 2) Language pertaining to the High-Level Panel and working in parallel with that process especially in Kenya, Mexico and Indonesia has been added in the background section.
- 3) The text has been amended accordingly to address marine pollution issues in general.
- 4) Please refer to the updated results framework that consists of additional quantifiable indicators - Outcome indicators for the project are all quantifiable, with added specific numeric targets for caucus membership, capacity-building programs held at the national and regional level, partnerships developed, and new national level and regional level laws/agreements/roadmaps/action plans.
- 5) Several of the listed initiatives are already mentioned in the text – e.g. Problue has been mentioned along with reference to other regional work done by development banks and non-governmental organizations. For e.g. in the baseline scenario for Eastern Africa the following has been mentioned “*LMEs along Africa’s eastern coastline that will be affected by this project include Agulhas Current and Somali Coastal Current LMEs. Each of these LMEs is described in Appendix 2. This project will coordinate with, learn from, and, as appropriate, support the objectives of, relevant GEF-financed projects working in the region such as RAFIP, WIO-SAP, and WIO LME SAPPHERE, as well as the strategic directions of the Regional Seas Programme (see 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination below for details). In addition, a number of CCN partners with whom we will engage are working in the region, including Conservation International, UN Environment, WWF, USAID, WCS, World Bank, UNDP, and others. Other donors and organizations with projects in the region that may be consulted include African Development Bank, The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), PROBLUE, Pew Charitable Trusts, Institute for Ocean Conservation Science, Ocean Conservancy, and many others.*” Additional references to PEMSEA etc have been made as well. As requested, the information has been moved to the core text from the appendices for ease of reference.
- 6) These have been mentioned throughout appendix 2 -4, but for ease of reference they have been moved to the core text in the portal submission
- 7) Addressed – the text has been added.

- 8) As mentioned, this information was available throughout appendix 2-4 but not it has now been moved to the core text in the portal submission. Language pertaining to the High-Level Panel on Sustainable Ocean Economy has also been added in the baseline section.
- 9) Addressed – the text has been added.

#### **12th December 2019:**

Upon agreement with ICCF, the objective statement has been amended to read as follows:

“Leverage and build upon existing parliamentary caucus architecture to raise awareness about blue economy opportunities and Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programs and elevate marine issues amongst legislators in order to facilitate regional cooperation.”

**8th January 2020:** The prodoc is part of the CEO endorsement document template. This is a one-step MSP. All the information required is in one document including Annexes A-T. This document has been uploaded as one file under the roadmap section.

#### **7 February 2020**

Changes have been made to remove reference to countries in the results framework and highlighted the changed text in yellow.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

#### **Agency Response**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): The implementing agency is not bringing any co-financing, please explain.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, above question still valid and expect to learn more during inception phase, as promised by implementing agency

8th of January 2020 (cseverin): The \$1.215 mio in-kind cofinancing is listed as "investment mobilized" such in kind cofinancing is more often than not recurrent investment. Please provide justification for selection or change accordingly.

24th of January 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

7th of February 2020 (cseverin): please provide justification for investment mobilized. it is not enough to refer to the cofinancing letters. We need to see a fuller description.

18th of February 2020 (cseverin): Addressed, by shifting investment mobilized to recurrent expenditure.

## Agency Response

26th November 2019

The co-financing from the implementing agency will be determined during the inception phase of the project.

**8th January 2020:** In-kind co-financing covers a variety of funding sources, including recurrent expenditures such as office spaces and salaries, but also time and advocacy investment by figureheads that have the ability to mobilize additional investment. For example, the time investment of CEOs from large companies, former Parliamentarians, and Heads of State that are partners of CCN has the potential to increase investment and raise awareness on a broader scale. This highly valuable time- donated in-kind- will, therefore, help in further mobilizing additional resources. Moreover, the public-private partnerships developed through the Caucus Model and the Conservation Council will also lead to in-kind co-financing for specific events and field missions. However, we understand that since this is forward-looking and we don't have secured future investments, the listed co-financing has been changed to **recurrent investment**.

## 7 February 2020

For this grant, we are not mobilizing any currently held restricted/dedicated assets; rather, we are drawing upon resources of our cofinanciers (including ICCF and the Conservation Council) as needed. We have now changed it to recurrent expenditures as there was a misinterpretation on the understanding of 'investment mobilized'

**5. GEF resource availability. 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

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure to have the project maangement cofinanced too.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Yes

## Agency Response

26th November 2019

The co-financing for the project management cost has been added to table B accordingly.

**STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal Area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal Area Set Aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**



### **Agency Response**

6. **Project Preparation Grant.** If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

### **Agency Response**

7. **Non-Grant Instrument.** If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

8. **Core Indicators.** Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please revise the core indicators.

- 1) Please reconsider the extreme high number included under indicator 5. Suggest to take this out all together. If then project will deliver on this indicator, that can be captured at a later stage.
- 2) UNder Indicator 5.2. Even thoguht the project will be working within a number of preidentified regions and their associated LMEs, please do not list them here. this subindicator should be 0.
- 3) under sub indicator 7.4. Please only enter one value, if that is 2, then please just include that and delete the LME specific ones that you have entered.
- 4) Please make sure to include data under core indicator 11.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Partly, while above comments have been addressed, it seems unlikely that the project will directly benefit more than 600 mio people. Please re-consider if this is possible.

13th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

26th November 2019:

- 1) As requested, the number of hectares and reference to 6 specific LMEs has been removed.
- 2) The sub-indicator value has been changed to 0.
- 3) The sub-indicator has been adjusted to reflect the value 2.
- 4) Core indicator 11 – value has been added. Please refer to response in question 11 under section II – project justification.

### 12th December 2019:

In consultation with ICCF and as per GEF Sec's request the gender metrics has been reduced to only cover the Caucus membership and no longer the anticipated caucus beneficiaries. The total caucus member is 247 of which 52 are female and 195 are male participants.

## 9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure that the the project is properly tagged under the RIO indicators, a ONE under climate adaptation could be argued for.

1) Further, since the project will be working towards stimulating political momentum around the implementation of SAP priorities. ithe project shodul be tagged on SAPs, TDAs and proberly also on all the different marine biomes, instead of singling out coral reefs. Please explain if there is a reason for why only one have been tagged here.

2) Please remove tag on PLASTICS (as project will not be working directly on plastic) and instead add Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater and Nutrient pollution from wastewater.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

26th November 2019:

- 1) The project in spite of having benefits to climate change adaptation, it cannot at this stage commit to Rio indicator 1, therefore, this was kept as it is.
- 2) As requested, the taxonomy tags have also been updated accordingly to capture TDA/SAPs and the other marine biomes.
- 3) Tags on nutrient pollution from wastewater and nutrients have been added.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure focus of the project is more clearly aligned with the objective of the project being to support stimulating political momentum towards implementation of the SAPs.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

The original concept for the project promoted transboundary cooperation through a focus on oceans issues in conservation caucuses and each target country, scaling up to have tangible environmental and social benefits for regional LMEs- as such, the project will need to coordinate with numerous transboundary projects, to include both the LME SAPs and programs of the implementing agency which the caucus model can support. It is acknowledged that the current text focuses disproportionately on UN Regional Seas Programs. Additional language on the LME SAPs and TDAs have been added to the global environmental benefits section, and other relevant programs will also be included in the appendices to address this. Please further refer to the response to question 1 and 2 under section I.

**2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): NO, please address points highlighted under question 2 in first section of review

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Please refer to response under question 2 under section I.

**3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address points highlighted under question 2 in first section of review

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Please refer to response under question 2 above.

**4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Partly, the last sentence of the portal submission under section 4, seems to make a pitch for the alignment of the project to the BD focal area. Please adjust so the description aligns the project with the IW focal Area.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Addressed

**5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please strengthen the section by elaborating on the existing baseline from eg GEF LME investments, UNDPs Ocean and Water Program, World Banks PROBLUE, ADBs Healthy Oceans Action Plan, High Level Panel of Sustianbale Ocean Economy.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Addressed, and also please refer to response to question 2 above.

**6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please expand on the GEBS to be delivered through the implementation of the SAPs, both nationally and regionally.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Please refer to updated GEBS in section 6.

**7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): yes

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted

**8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin): NA, global intervention

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted

**9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin):Yes

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted

**11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin):Partly, description is fine, but please add information on gender disaggregated data under core indicator 11.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Partly, even though indicator 11 now features disaggregated data, it seems that the number included is too high as a number of persons to be directly benefitting.

13th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

8th of January 2020 (cseverin): Please ensure that the submission includes a gender analysis or equivalent analysis.

24th of January 2020 (cseverin): Addressed, Additional information in the response from the agency, clarifies that the gender analysis in the three region, that the project will be active, is based on gender analytical data from World Economic Forum

## Agency Response

26th November 2019

Addressed, please refer to updated values in the core indicator section in the portal.

According to the 2018 World Economic Forum Global Gender Gap Report, political empowerment is where the gender gap in the world remains the widest. This project not only benefits the many women in the world that depend on the many resources that the ocean has to offer, but it specifically empowers women in politics to represent the interests of women in marine conservation in developing the legislative outcomes of the project- these numbers can be quantified to represent the number of women benefitting from the project. Women leaders in conservation will not only have greater consideration for the effect of policy on other women, but will also inspire other girls and women to become leaders in conservation, as well. Based on targets for caucus membership rosters to reflect the gender breakdown of parliaments and legislative bodies and the average population of legislative constituencies, the gender disaggregation reflects the number of direct women beneficiaries of the project, as well as the total number of beneficiaries.

12th December 2019: In consultation with ICCF and as per GEF Sec's request the gender metrics has been reduced to only cover the Caucus membership and no longer the anticipated caucus beneficiaries. The total caucus member is 247 of which 52 are female and 195 are male participants.

12

	Women directly benefitting from female caucus members	Total direct beneficiaries
<b>Colombia</b>	12449954	80582227
<b>Mexico</b>	34417978	151454249

<b>Indonesia</b>	7603068	153597329
<b>Thailand</b>	1408572	17886626
<b>Kenya</b>	5701710	75270098
<b>Tanzania</b>	1810220	59157503
<b>Mozambique</b>	756774	95137284

**12th December 2019:**

In consultation with ICCF and as per GEF Sec's request the gender metrics has been reduced to only cover the Caucus membership and no longer the anticipated caucus beneficiaries. The total caucus member is 247 of which 52 are female and 195 are male participants.

**8th January 2020:**

As highlighted in the Gender section on page 51 of the CEO endorsement documents/prodoc, the project intends to ensure gender equality throughout execution. The project will mainly work with caucus members and as mentioned in the gender section they will ensure equal participation and also work with several organizations across regions that focus on this topic. Even though this is a global project targeting three regions with no on the ground interventions, a preliminary gender analysis was conducted for each country involved in the Project to calculate the gender-disaggregated indicators for the project. This analysis utilized population and gender data from the World Economic Forum, including breakdowns of female representation in the Government and specifically in representative branches, to analyze the impact of a proportional number of female representatives participating in the caucus and the potential impact of that participation on women and men in constituencies. During execution, the project will collect this gender-disaggregated data, and gender mainstreaming will also be achieved by the use of a gender lens in the gathering and analysis of data.

**12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted



**13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted

**14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin): yes. Even though this is a global project, it will be engaging with countries through the regionally ministerially endorsed Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Programmes. As countries have endorsed these long-term vision investment plans, that the project will be supporting activities around, priorities are aligned with national priorities.

**Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Noted, as mentioned above, please note that the ICCF Group Caucus Model operates by supporting conservation priorities identified by its legislative members, which often results from consultations with the ICCF Group and other close stakeholders. However, as a foreign-based secretariat, the ICCF Group does not and cannot dictate the agenda for caucuses. Recognizing that the priorities and commitments of legislative bodies can in some cases differ from other government entities in the

same country, it would be premature to commit to developing legislative action in specific support of the SAPs without knowing whether the legislative bodies of the participating countries have also committed to the targets of the SAPs. This being said, the SAPs are likely to contain issue areas of interest to members and as such will likely contribute to the priorities identified by members, but the ICCF Group cannot guarantee it.

**16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Noted

**17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12th of November 2019 (cseverin): Budgeted M& E plan included. but please remove financial audit costs, that according to GEF policies are to be paid by the PM budget line

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): Please address above comment, in submitted MSP document, financial audit is still featuring under M&E budget. The portal entry mentions M&E plan as part of annex Q, however, Annex Q can not be located. please upload.

13th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

7th of February 2020 (cseverin): Please ensure that the cost of Audit is not only removed from M&E budget table, but also ensure that the total of the M&E budget tehnelct that this budget line is not longer part of the M&E budget. Currently that is not the case.

Further, please considering ensuring that there is consistency between budget lines in the full budget and the GEF financing budget. In GEF financing budget M&E is covered under budget line 5303 and 5304 and in full budget M&E is only covered by 5303.

18th of February 2020 (cseverin): Addressed. The M&E budget is annexed in the full project document submission, uploaded to the portal (starts on pp 134.).

### **Agency Response**

26th November 2019

Addressed, please refer to Annex Q of the CEO Endorsement document under roadmap– the audit cost was actually already part of the budget (Annex H) under the PMC.

12th December 2019:

As discussed with GEF Sec., this had been addressed in full. As stated above, Annex Q is part of the CEO endorsement document appended in the ROADMAP section of the portal. As discussed the audit costs were reflected as charged to the PMC from the onset both in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan on pages 141 and 142 of the CEO document as well as in Annex H. See below screenshots.

Financial Audits		PSC	10,000 – Part of PMC costs	Annually				
Project Implementation Period		Project Coordinator		Within 3 months of the				
Project implementation period: TBD								
From:		Expenditure by project component/activity		Expenditure by calendar year				
To:		1	2	PMC	TOTAL	Year 1 2019	Year 2 2020	TOTAL
UNEP Budget Line								
10	PERSONNEL COMPONENT							0
1100	Project personnel							0
50	MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT				0			
5100	Operation and maintenance of equipment				0			
5101	Equipment Maintenance				0			
5201	Publications, Translations, Dissemination and reporting costs	10,000	14,000		24,000	12,000	12,000	24,000
5202	Audit reports			10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000
5301	Communications (tel, fax, e-mail, etc)	34,000	10,531	734	45,265	18,106	27,159	45,265
5302	Others	16,000	8,000		24,000	12,000	12,000	24,000
5303	Terminal Evaluation			35,000	35,000		35,000	35,000
5304	Tech. Support & other M& E (including inception workshop, PSC meeting, closing workshop)		20,000	25,000	45,000	20,000	25,000	45,000
5399	Sub-total	60,000	52,531	70,734	183,265	62,106	121,159	183,265
5999	Component total	60,000	52,531	70,734	183,265	62,106	121,159	183,265
99	Subtotal TOTAL	1,416,450	403,731	179,234	1,999,415	906,155	1,093,260	1,999,415

7th February 2020

Revisions have been made on the budget (excel) as well as the MSP document - annex P and attached in the roadmap section

**18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, this project is to stimulate political momentum to support the regional ministerial endorsed LME Strategic Action Programs. The focus of the current document seems to have been changed since the initial discussions. Please make sure that it is clear that this project is focused on the original intent and not about supporting GEF implementing agency processes.

please ensure the objective and results framework reflects upon the linkages to the implementation of LME SAPs and that key LME investments are reflected upon in the section on project justification.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): OK

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

As mentioned above, the original concept for the project promoted transboundary cooperation through a focus on oceans issues in conservation caucuses and each target country, scaling up to have tangible environmental and social benefits for regional LMEs- as such, the project will need to coordinate with numerous other transboundary projects, to include both the LME SAPs and programs of the implementing agency which the caucus model can support. Additional language on the transboundary projects have been added to the results framework and specific information on SAPs in the body of the document to address this focus.

#### **19. Annexes:**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 14th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Noted

**Project Results Framework**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 14th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

**26th November 2019**

Noted

**GEF Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Council comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**STAP comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Convention Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Other Agencies comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** none requested

**Agency Response**

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA, Global

**Agency Response**

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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** NA, global project

## **Agency Response**

**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**

## **Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

### **1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments.

11th of December 2019 (cseverin): No please address comments.

13th of December 2019 (cseverin): Yes, project recommended for CEO Approval

8th of January 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments

24th of January 2020 (cseverin): Yes, project is recommended for CEO Approval

7th of February 2020 (cseverin): No, Please address comments.

18th of February 2020 (cseverin): Yes, Project is recommended for CEO Approval

**Review Dates**

**1SMSP CEO Approval**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The oceans cover 75% of the earth’s surface and are essential for the earth’s weather patterns, temperature regulation, and air quality. The ocean and its ecosystems support the global economy, millions of jobs, vital food resources, the global tourism industry, global health services, and many more. The oceans have only recently started to gain recognition for the goods and services they provide to local communities and the world as a whole. As a result, the concept of the “blue economy” has emerged and been increasingly adopted to highlight the close linkages between the sustainable use of ocean resources and the wellbeing of the people. To address marine challenges and capitalize on blue economy opportunities, it is essential to create transboundary marine governance schemes that ensure cooperation at all levels of government and across a wide range of sectors. Through its International Waters program, the GEF is working to develop transboundary Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) through which countries work together toward long-term sustainability of shared LMEs.



The project will create the enabling environment to effectively address marine biodiversity challenges in targeted LMEs through new and enhanced laws, regulations, and policies and transboundary cooperation. These improvements will generate environmental benefits extending to the greater good of the economy, progress, and many other realms and will help to safeguard globally significant biodiversity.

Common threats to biodiversity in the target LMEs are overfishing, destructive fishing practices, and pollution/marine debris. All are essentially resource management issues which impact both the citizens of each country targeted by this project and the natural environment. By building awareness and capacity among policymakers, one of the goals of this project is to raise awareness of the impacts of these issues on the blue economy and provide experts to advise on international best practices to help confront these conservation challenges.

The awareness and capacity built through briefings, events, and regional interactions created as part of the outputs in this program are designed to significantly raise levels of knowledge and engagement about key issues, including not only direct threats to biodiversity but also the need to mainstream marine conservation with other issues including employment, public access, local land rights especially of indigenous peoples, and effects of changes upon women.